

LEGISLATIVE ASSEMBLY OF SASKATCHEWAN
Third Session — Seventeenth Legislature
35th Day

Wednesday, March 14, 1973

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

WELCOME TO STUDENTS

Mr. Meakes (Touchwood): — Mr. Speaker, I should like to introduce to you and through you to the other Members of this Legislature 38 Grade Ten students in the east gallery. They are led by their teachers Mr. Grossman and Mr. Ledingham. I hope to meet with them later. In the meantime I hope while they are in this Chamber they have an educational and informational day and wish them a safe journey home.

Hon. Members: — Hear, hear!

Mr. Pepper (Weyburn): — Mr. Speaker, it is my pleasure to introduce to you and through you to the Members of this Assembly a group of Grade Eight students sitting in the west gallery. These students are from the Junior High School in Weyburn, a class of some 70 in number. They are here under the guidance of their teachers Jim Nedelcov and Bill Fletcher and their bus drivers Del Halbert and Carl Borshowa. These students, Mr. Speaker, are having a guided tour through the building and have already had their lunch in our cafeteria. I am sure that it is our hope that their trip into Regina was enjoyable and that their entire day's experience proves educational and leave them with a greater knowledge of their provincial democratic system of government in action. We wish them a safe and pleasant journey home.

Hon. Members: — Hear, hear!

QUESTIONS

Staff Dismissals In Continuing Education

Mr. MacDonald (Milestone): — Mr. Speaker, before the Orders of the Day I should like to direct a question to the Minister of Education. I was wondering if, in the interim between yesterday and today, the Minister has had an opportunity to find out who is being dismissed in his department without his knowledge? I have subsequently got confirmation of the report, that eight or ten employees in his department have received termination notices as of the month of June. They have been given absolutely no assurance of obtaining alternate employment in the civil service. I want to repeat my question as of yesterday. Will the Minister give us the names of those people who have had their employment terminated? Will he also state the reasons to the Legislature why he is summarily treating dedicated civil servants in this manner?

Mr. MacMurchy (Minister of Education): — Mr. Speaker, my apologies to the Member for Milestone yesterday who asked me a question along the same lines as the one today. In the question yesterday he requested the names of dismissed senior staff within the Department of Continuing Education. I suppose that my thinking of senior staff may well have been different than his thinking of senior staff. I was thinking of people from the director level up. I was certainly not aware of dismissals along those lines. With respect to the names I can't respond today to the Member's question. I suggested to him yesterday that he might put a question on the Order Paper and I could provide the names. I do not have them in my mind. But with respect to the notices of dismissal may I indicate to the Member for Milestone that as he well knows the Department of Continuing Education is newly established, because it is new established there was a new organization established for it. There was a transfer personnel from Education into Continuing Education immediately, even before the new organization was established. The organization is somewhat along these lines in a fairly general way — administration, finance which is shared between the two departments A separate branch for research and development, a separate branch for colleges and also the Institute operation. We have decided to decentralize completely the Institute operations and the three principals really run that shop in a sense, rather than having a whole host of consultant and program people within the department. This means that the people who were employed in that capacity in the Department of Education those positions have been removed. The idea is and the proposition is that these people be transferred into the Institutes. Now that means displacement, that means a movement of those people because their areas are basically related to the technical vocational field which applies in Saskatoon and in Moose Jaw. Thus the termination, thus the time with respect to the termination, the 1st of June. It allows them an opportunity to seek employment in other fields in Regina, if employment elsewhere isn't available to them certainly we will find positions for them in the decentralized operation in Saskatoon and Moose Jaw at the Institutes there. There may be opportunities for them in Regina outside of the Department of Continuing Education. There may be, if they so desire, they can seek employment in position that will be opening up in colleges branch and in the area of research and planning.

Mr. MacDonald: — Mr. Speaker, a supplementary question. First of all I cannot accept the Minister's statement about assurances of employment. Reorganization has been going on in the Government of Saskatchewan for many, many years without termination of notices for employees. I should also like to tell him I can give him the names, I won't give you the names publicly because I don't want to embarrass them. Also I want to tell you I can give you the date of the Cabinet Minute, the date of confirmation.

Mr. Speaker: — Order . . . the Member's question. We can't debate a statement.

Mr. MacDonald: — Mr. Speaker, I have no intention of debating it. All I want to say, Mr. Speaker, I want to ask the Minister if he will give assurances they will be offered employment.

March 14, 1973

He says that they may seek employment, they may apply for other jobs. What happens if they can't find employment in other departments? It is clear he has terminated their position, their employment. Will he give this House and those civil servants a guarantee that they will be selected for other positions within the civil service?

Mr. MacMurchy: — Mr. Speaker, I think I indicated in my answer previously that those positions so far as Continuing Education in Regina in Avord Tower are no longer there, they no longer exist. I think we have given the employees an opportunity to seek employment elsewhere. I think I did say, if the opportunity wasn't available to them here we would find employment for them within the Institutes. It really is a decentralization operation. We were finding, and one of the reasons we moved this way, we were finding a great deal of duplication within the department and within the Institutes and we are trying to eliminate that. To that I think the Member would agree.

Some Hon. Members: — Hear, hear!

Hearing Aid Dealers

Mr. MacDonald (Moose Jaw North): — A question to the Minister of Health. To avoid a long preface to my question, I would refer to the letter that all Members received from the Saskatchewan Hearing Aid dealers. The hearing aid dealers have indicated that they are prepared to co-operate with the Government and they have continually appealed to the Minister to meet with them and have had no success to date. It now appears that the dealers are in danger of being put out of business. My question is: Will the Minister consider co-ordinating the proposed government program with the services now offered by the independent dealers in order to assure the hard-of-hearing public in Saskatchewan that they will continue to have access to services of private dealers?

Hon. Mr. Smishek (Minister of Public Health): — Mr. Speaker, the Member makes reference to meetings. May I advise the Hon. Member, in case he isn't aware, that I have already met on two occasions with the dealers. I intend to have a further meeting with the dealers. In fact I am trying to arrange a meeting with them to discuss some of the thoughts that we as a Government have. We will be discussing our suggestions with the dealers, and as I advised a day or so ago, the Government program will be announced in due course.

Mr. MacDonald: — A supplementary, Mr. Speaker. It is my understanding from the letter they had not met with the Minister. I have met with the hearing aid dealers . . .

Mr. Speaker: — Order, order!

I think the Hon. Member will agree that questions are not to be based on communications from outside the Assembly. While I have permitted it, the rules don't permit that. We can't follow that up any further.

Staff Dismissal in Continuing Education

Mr. McIsaac (Wilkie): — Mr. Speaker, in light of the non-answer of the Minister of Education, I want to address a question to the Attorney General. Of all the callous and shameful moves really as far as staff shuffling since this Government has taken over, this question of these 10 positions in Education that the Minister can't guarantee a job to. In light of the fact there are 20 or 30 new positions as revealed in an Order for Return in the new Department of Continuing Education, surely the Attorney General will guarantee to this House that these people will be employed somewhere in the Government. To me this is ridiculous. Mr. Speaker.

Hon. Mr. Romanow (Attorney General): — Mr. Speaker, I can't make any response of commitment to the Hon. Member. First of all with respect to the Department of Continuing Education the Minister has much more intimate knowledge than I will ever have. I am sure that the best advice and best information that can be given has been given by the Minister of Continuing Education.

With respect to the matter of employment generally throughout the Government, all that I would advise is to wait and see what happens with respect to the Department of Continuing Education. We will keep this under continual observation.

Mr. McIsaac: — A supplementary. We have seen what has happened and I don't like what is happening, that is why we are asking for some justice. As the Minister of Justice, I approach him to try and insure that these people do get some fair treatment and they are not getting it from the Minister of Education.

Hon. Mr. Romanow: — All that I can say again, Mr. Speaker, to repeat. On the general observation I have it noted that we will keep our eyes open to see what possibilities are available. I can't be more definite than that. I am sure the Hon. Member from Wilkie will appreciate it and the Members opposite. It is just impossible at this particular time.

Mr. Richards (Saskatoon University): — Mr. Speaker, I should like to take this occasion before the Orders of the Day to make a great announcement of some significance to the political community of the province. I have the privilege of tabling in the House the third issue of "Next Year Country" which is a news magazine of some significance in addition to the foreign dominated daily press of Saskatchewan. I think that Members will find it to be truly a non-partisan magazine with no partisan bias for the interests of one party or the other, but quite free-wheeling critical journalism which is certainly something that this province has lacked in recent years and which has a great tradition in the past. I hope that Members on both sides of the House will avail themselves of the occasion to learn what is truly happening in the policies of our province.

ADJOURNED DEBATES

SECOND READINGS

The Assembly resumed the adjourned debate on the proposed motion by Hon. Mr. MacMurchy that Bill No. 66 – **An Act respecting Community Colleges** be now read a second time.

Mr. Faris (Arm River): — Mr. Speaker, I am very pleased to have this opportunity to address a few comments regarding the community college system which has been established in this province. Those who are aware of the situation across Canada will be aware that the community college model in Saskatchewan is a unique one. Nowhere in Canada, nowhere else in this world do I know of a system of community colleges which is intended to be built around the programs and the needs of people rather than around campuses and the needs of administration and faculty and so on.

The principle that we are trying to deal with here is that of equality of education opportunity in the province. Those of us who represent rural parts of the province are aware that there has always been a problem and will probably always be problems in regard to providing equal opportunity to the people who live in the rural areas. This is partly because of the sparsity of population and the distances which must be travelled. Because of these factors it is very difficult to get groupings of students together in order to give them the variety of opportunities that can be had in the city. This is true of secondary education, but it is even more true of post-secondary education. If you look where our universities and our technical schools are located you will find them where you would naturally expect them to be, that is in the city. We find that of the 18 to 24 age group in this province that there is only some 18 per cent of these people in this age group who are attending the universities and the technical schools located in the cities. That means that some 82 per cent of the people in this age group are not able to take advantage of post-secondary education. A large percentage of that number would be people who live out in rural areas.

In addition to that there is also a large proportion of the population that is over 24 and which has a wide variety of educational needs. Unless these people happen to live in the cities there is not much question but that they have not had an equal opportunity to have access to academic type courses or vocational courses or simply non-credit interest type courses. There have been some attempts by local government educational authorities to provide this, but I would think that, very largely, by their own admission these have not been as successful as they would like to have seen them. Therefore, the community college program which we are suggesting is going to meet a very great need and an increasing need. That is, as people understand that education isn't something that ends with Grade eight or Grade ten or Grade twelve or even with university, but rather is something that should be part of a person's entire life, all of their life, we are going to have growing demand for full opportunities for post-secondary education. It is to meet this need that the community college system in Saskatchewan has been designed. It has some rather unique features which I am sure will be appreciated by Members on both sides of this House.

I think, for instance, of the use of existing facilities. There are in many parts of the province, rural parts of the province, very fine facilities available right now. They are not being used as fully as they can be and it is the intention of the present model of community college to use these facilities. This will mean of course a great saving in cost and this saving in cost can be applied towards keeping the fees low and providing the kind of staff that would meet the wide variety of courses that might be desired.

Another important point is that the community college system as we are experimenting with it in these pilot projects is going to be largely financed by the province, rather than by local finances. There will be some sorts of fee structures established. Once again this is very largely along the lines of the universities and technical schools which we have at present. That is, the largest amount of financial responsibility is going to be borne by the province. This is only right. If we are going to bear the large proportion of cost in the cities, universities and technical schools, we should also bear this large proportion of cost out in the rural areas. It is for that reason that of course the Bill requires budget approval because a very large amount of the budget will be provided by the province. I was pleased to see that the Opposition agreed with this principle.

There is one matter which the Opposition has raised which I think is a legitimate matter of concern and that is that initially this Bill proposes that the boards of these community colleges will be appointed rather than elected. It is quite obvious that this Bill is a Bill that really applies to the community college pilot projects. If the Members opposite will study the Community College Advisory Report, they will be aware of the fact that the report suggested that in the initial stages these boards should be appointed rather than elected. The most obvious reason for this in the initial stages is that this concept of community college is new, it is unique. There is not a pool of people in this province or any other province who at present understand how this community college model is going to work. It may very well be the case that the Members in this House who haven't studied the Advisory Committee Report don't understand how this is going to work. I suggest it is very realistic to believe that it is going to take a number of years before people, having actually seen this in action, will be able to understand it. And at that time I am sure that there is going to be some system of election of community college officials so that this control can be in the community college regions.

Mr. Speaker, I am sure that this Bill has already had the approval of a good number of Members opposite, I hope that it will have unanimous approval of this House and I am very pleased to speak in favor of it.

Some Hon. Members: — Hear, hear!

Mr. Tchorzewski (Minister of Youth and Culture): — Mr. Speaker, I too should like to make a few comments on this Bill and on the program of community colleges which is being established in Saskatchewan.

March 14, 1973

I think, Mr. Speaker, that in many ways this is once again a milestone in education in Saskatchewan, something which Saskatchewan has been noted for in the area of education as well as other fields for many, many years. I think this major step is a very important move. It is in keeping with the traditions of this province which have been established over the years in education under the leadership of such people as the late Woodrow Lloyd and are now being carried on under the leadership of the present Minister of Education (Mr. MacMurchy) Member for Last Mountain.

Mr. Speaker, I think that education has developed and has been geared to develop people to sort of fit like parts into an economic system which provides slots for them to fit into. I think an education system must do more than that. That is why, I think, that the concept of the community college as proposed now, as recommended last year by the study that was done through the Department of Education is important. That is why I think it is very important because it moves away, partially at least, from the idea that the only purpose of education is to develop people to fit into certain economic slots in our economic system.

The study that was carried out and made the recommendations was very valuable. The group was very fortunate that they were able to learn a lot from mistakes made in other provinces. I think that when one looks at the errors that were made in places like Ontario in the establishment of community colleges where now there has developed more of a junior college situation with campuses rather than community colleges serving the community, I think we are fortunate in Saskatchewan to be able to learn from those errors and develop a program which will be of great benefit to people, particularly the people in rural Saskatchewan.

I have for a long time, Mr. Speaker, been concerned about the tendency of our society to concentrate almost solely on the visible material things of life at the expense of the esthetic, the social and the human needs and I think that this has led to building of some structures that may in the future stand as a symbol that will be used by generations who have yet to come, as an example in explaining the stupidity and the greed and the sort of misdirection of present day man. When I look at the education system, I look at many well-meaning and potentially useful and meaningful objectives that in the past have been lost or buried because those who have endeavored to carry them out have been steered away for some reason or another in a direction of only building the physical structures, and losing in that concentration, losing sight of the social and the human aspects and the social and the human needs. And the fact that Saskatchewan's community college program specifically moves away from the idea of the campus, away from the collection of expensive buildings that often stand empty for most of the year, I think, is a very important fact.

We have in every community in this province existing buildings that can be better utilized than they are now. We have schools that are used only part of the day and part of the year and that sit empty most of the time. We have halls in all our communities and other buildings which could very well be utilized by the community and by the community college. It is not necessary to put up costly single function monuments in order to provide facilities in which to educate people. Existing

facilities as I have said can serve this purpose very well. This experiment has the virtue of seeking to fill proven needs without adding another millstone to the load already carried by the local taxpayer.

Mr. Speaker, there are other benefits of the community colleges which relate to Saskatchewan as basically a rural agricultural province. The population in rural Saskatchewan cannot be attributed solely to the economics of farming. It has a cultural cause too. People have been attracted over the years to the bigger cities. Not only because it was difficult in some periods of time to make the kind of living that people would have liked to make on the farm, but they have been attracted to the bigger centres and attracted to places out of the province because of the opportunities that were offered in the cities of Canada. And, therefore, it is not enough just to talk about preserving the family farm. It is not enough just to talk about saving rural communities and providing the opportunity for rural communities to develop. It is not enough just to talk about people staying in rural Saskatchewan. We have to provide programs that are going to provide the kinds of opportunity that people in this day and age expect to have. I think that the community college concept as it is being proposed is going a long way in providing some of those opportunities.

Schools in the past, Mr. Speaker, and I am personally one who very recently went through our school system, have encouraged in many cases, students to leave rural Saskatchewan. I can recall a number of occasions when I, as a young person in school, right from the grade one level until I was through high school, being told time after time by some of my teachers and in fact told by my parents, that 'you have to go to school'. And I, like any other student, who does so today – and I, myself, taught students as short a time ago as a little over a year ago – used to ask that one important question. Why do I have to go to school? It seems like a waste of time to me. And the answer I always got, or usually got at that time (thank God that it is beginning to change a little bit) the answer that I used to get was, 'well you have got to go to school so that you can get off the farm so you can go into the city to make a better living'. I think that that was very unfortunate. I think that is an example we can use in an argument which says that the reasons for depopulation of rural Saskatchewan and the reasons for people moving away from rural Saskatchewan are more than just economic reasons. I think, Mr. Speaker, that the community college is an exciting ideal intended to provide a range of learning opportunities in personal enrichment and community education for adults.

I want to quote, Mr. Speaker, from a comment made by the community college committee which reported to the Minister of Education (Mr. MacMurchy) in August, 1972. They described the community college as:

a learning system so much an integral part of the community that no single set of buildings would be considered the college campus or the college staff. Rather the community would be the campus and those with knowledge and attitudes worth sharing with the potential staff and the students.

I think, Mr. Speaker, that is what the community college should be and I am very happy to see that that is the direction

March 14, 1973

in which it is going.

Mr. Speaker, depopulation, poverty and cultural disintegration are undermining what was once a strong sense of community in the country. And community colleges could restore and maintain that sense.

I am very pleased, Mr. Speaker, that one of the areas that one of the four pilot projects that was designated to carry out this experiment with community colleges was an area in which my constituency of Humboldt is located. I can say from talking to people in my constituency and in communities surrounding my constituency that the response to the community college concept has been one of enthusiasm and excitement. There have been a number of meetings that have been held at which large numbers of people have attended and have expressed the interest in the community college program as proposed. I think the example of the wide range of programs that have been suggested and requested are an indication of the interest. Suggestions have been made to include programs and courses on business administration, on languages, including the French and the German language. I think it is particularly exciting that in the Humboldt area which predominantly consists of people of German origin, there is an interest, a growing interest in maintaining the language of their forefathers and I think the community college may go a long way in helping this develop.

Some Hon. Members: — Hear, hear!

Mr. Tchorzewski: — There has been an interest expressed in the area of the arts and the crafts and homemaking, in various seminars. That is only a short list of the many, many things that people are requesting already.

I think I could quote from a letter which I picked out of the last edition of the Watson Witness by a person who resides in the Humboldt pilot project area, which better expresses the feeling about the community college program than I probably could, Mr. Speaker. I quote:

The college is the community and the community is the college. There is an increasing need and desire for formal and informal learning at the regional community level. Community colleges can bring continuing opportunities for growth by giving the kind of education people want, where they need it and when they need it. The community college will offer and facilitate the development of educational programs in any area of living which the community wishes. You, the community, influence the unique make-up of the college. You can all become part of the program of decision-making by telling the committee what you are interested in. If there are enough people wanting to study or have that program then it will be planned for. Programs will change to meet changing needs and concerns. And hopefully, there will be programs available to benefit any interested person regarding previous knowledge.

The letter ends, Mr. Speaker, by saying:

This is a great opportunity.

And I agree.

In closing I just want to say, as has been done before, I am very pleased that the Members of the Opposition are supporting the community college and express support for the community college concept. I want to congratulate the Minister for providing the outstanding leadership in the development of this kind of unique program. It has the benefit of being developed while aware of the mistakes that were made in other jurisdictions. Most important the community is the college as the letter I have just read indicated. There is a true decentralization. This will provide more opportunities to a wider range of people who will be able to become involved in programs and projects and classes of their choice without having to travel away from their community often for long distances.

Mr. Speaker, rural Saskatchewan is a great way of life. Rural Saskatchewan communities have the spirit and they have the determination and the vitality to not only survive but to develop. They have true sense of community where people work together for the benefit of all the citizens of that community. There have been serious difficulties in recent years as the agricultural economy became depressed and many communities suffered. And some have been dealt a blow from which they have never recovered.

Community colleges in a true sense will help to restore and maintain that sense of community. Other imaginative and courageous programs which have been dealt with in the House such as the FarmStart program and Land Bank program, and others will help to provide the kind of economic base which may prevent the collapse we so recently witnessed.

Mr. Speaker, I think that this legislation is very significant legislation for this year. I think that this unique concept of a community college that serves the community where it is, is the kind of concept and the kind of program which other jurisdictions will be looking at in the future. I am very pleased to support the Bill. Mr. Speaker, I know that there are others who want to make some comments on this legislation and at this time I beg leave to adjourn the debate.

Some Hon. Members: — Hear, hear!

Debate adjourned.

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. Oliver (Shaunavon): — Mr. Speaker, I should like to take the opportunity to rebut the few remarks that the Hon. Member for Morse (Mr. Wiebe) has made in regard to Bill 50 – Amendments to The Natural Products Marketing Act.

He has accused the Government of misleading the people. Mr. Speaker, I read with considerable interest the Hon. Member's legislative report in the February 8th edition of the Swift Current Sun. The headline reads, "Marketing Commission a Threat". He cites such programs as Land Bank as ones that the individual farmer didn't have any input into and

didn't have any opportunity to adequately voice his opinion prior to the implementation of the program.

Now I am sure the Hon. Member is well aware of the fact that we took the Land Bank program throughout the province and farmers had an opportunity to discuss it. And it is a success because the farmers have had some input into it and some of their own ideas are there. I should like to quote part of Mr. Wiebe's report. I quote:

At no time was it suggested by the Minister that such a commission (referring to the Hog Marketing Commission) be used by government to set up a marketing board under normal circumstances or without the necessary 60 per cent positive vote by producers. It now appears the Minister, Mr. Messer, has decided to use the new section of the Act to set up a hog marketing commission without the usual 60 per cent favorable vote by producers.

The Hon. Member knows very well that commissions do not need a vote whereas boards do. He is deliberately misleading the public on this one.

A further deception occurs in the next paragraph where he says:

Not one hog producer in Saskatchewan has been notified of this nor has been given the opportunity to vote or at least state his opinion by use of a form letter or some other means.

I am sure he is also aware that the Hog producers Association and the Swine Breeders Association were involved in discussions which took place months before the November announcement was made by the Minister. Then he goes on in the next paragraph and he changes his tune a bit and he goes on as if he was the great protector of all hog producers in the province and he states:

During this Session I will press the Minister of Agriculture to provide a guarantee that before a Hog Marketing Board or production quotas are implemented that each producer will have the opportunity of voicing his opinion and that a 60 per cent favorable vote will be required before implementation.

Again, he knows that the board requires a vote and here he is really taking on the status that he is trying to make out that something that has already been accomplished, he is trying to promise this and make it look as if he, through some pressure on the Minister, has brought it about. Mr. Speaker, it is a sad day when a Member of this House has to stoop to tactics so low as to mislead the public in believing that he has achieved something like this. But, Mr. Speaker, this gentleman is a hog producer and he stands to gain by this Commission and yet he takes the position of going all out opposing this program strictly for cheap political gain. It is a tactic, of course, Mr. Speaker, that the Members opposite have used for a long time and no time in history has this Liberal Party represented by those rag-tag few to your left, come on so strong against the small farmer of Saskatchewan. They have opposed every piece of legislation that we have introduced which is designed to help the farmer. Their opposition to the Land Bank has been the

most vicious since Medicare was introduced. Here is a political party that is so confused and disorganized that they don't know whether they are coming or going. They go from one extreme to the other and this is evidenced by the Medicare crisis where they were really agitating and sponsoring these doctor strikes through the KOD, then all the way across the panel they swing to the vicious and malicious use of Bill 2. They are so obsessed with financial and political power whether it be in their own political party leadership or the provincial power that, Mr. Speaker, they can't tell the difference between the band wagon and the manure spreader.

Some Hon. Members: — Hear, hear!

Mr. Oliver: — Judging by the prolific rumors of the Liberals opposite, it is obvious which one they are on.

Now, Mr. Speaker, during the Liberal administration they refused to do anything about hog marketing in the province, obviously because they had sold out to the large corporations which did not want that kind of activity for the little man in Saskatchewan. We do not intend to sit idly by and see the development of livestock potential in this province ignored because of the narrow-vested interests of the Liberal Party which they condone and advocate.

The world market for pork is one of the most rapidly growing markets of today. Saskatchewan has a tremendous capacity to utilize the grain and farm resources at its disposal to produce pork and meet the dual objectives of feeding a hungry world and providing some income for Saskatchewan farmers. I would ask Members opposite, especially the Member for Cannington (Mr. Weatherald) to put aside their petty politics and support the family farm by voting for orderly marketing.

Some Hon. Members: — Hear, hear!

Mr. Weatherald (Cannington): — Mr. Speaker, I am pleased to be in favor of the family farm as I always have, however, I may differ a little bit in the approach that the last Member would use. First of all I want to deal with some of the comments he has made about the Member for Morse (Mr. Wiebe) which I think were fantastically unfair. I think his information is inaccurate and exhibits his lack of understanding of the present situation.

When the Member from Morse indicated that in setting up the Land Bank there had been little consultation with the farmers of Saskatchewan, he was absolutely correct, Mr. Speaker. He was correct because I went to one of those meetings, I went to the one in Yorkton. There were about 1,500 to 2,000 people there. After we had listened to the Minister of Agriculture (Mr. Messer) give his speech and after a booklet had been distributed — I forget the name of it — we all received one proposing how the plan would work, it was after approximately two hours and there was time for about two questions left for participation from the audience or at the most, three. To think that the people there participated in the formation of the policy was absolutely incorrect because the fact that you are going to make a speech to a large crowd doesn't mean that the crowd has much participation or input into what is happening. While the Minister conducted a few meetings around the province

and tried to explain how the Land Bank would be conducted, nobody really had any participation or input into the plan. When the plan came forward it was identical to what had been projected by the Minister of Agriculture long before he had any meetings. In other words there was no consultation and no changes were made in the Land Bank. The Member for Morse was absolutely correct when he says, Mr. Speaker, that the input into the Land Bank was extremely little by the people or the farmers of Saskatchewan. It was meaningless as my colleague says.

Mr. Speaker, on the point raised by the Member for Shaunavon (Mr. Oliver) that this is a Hog Marketing Commission, certainly there is a difference between the Products Marketing Act calling for a board and the one that presently exists today after the Government brought in the Commission. The Commission made sure that there was a difference. Never before until last year when the amendment was brought into this House could a board be set up for natural products without the express consent of the producers. Certainly there is a difference, that is the difference. The amendment last year made the difference because it made possible for the Government to bring in a government sponsored and backed board without asking the producers whether they wanted it or not and without a vote. In other words, Mr. Speaker, it made it possible for the Government to set up any kind of a marketing board that they wanted without the consent of the bona fide producers throughout the Province of Saskatchewan.

Mr. Cody: — How did you vote?

Mr. Weatherald: — I'll tell you how we voted last year. We voted in favor of a Natural Products Act by orderly marketing but not in favor of the Government bringing in a Commission with no vote. I want to bring to your attention exactly what the Minister of Agriculture said because never has there been a case of anybody misleading this House to a greater extent than did the Minister of Agriculture when he brought in the amendment to the Act last year. The reason for it was obvious, either he didn't know what was in it or he absolutely and intentionally misled what his true intentions were. Last year when he brought in the amendment regarding a Commission he talked, Mr. Speaker, about drastic prices, about situations existing where he only mentions grain that we may need a board sponsored by the Government in extreme exceptional cases. Not once did the Minister of Agriculture ever suggest that the Government would be willing to use the power that they gave themselves to set up a board sponsored by the Government, a board which would deny producers a vote.

We, on this side of the House, accepted what the Minister of Agriculture said and I might say that it will be one of the last times that we accept what the Minister of Agriculture says. It is obvious that what he told us was not in accordance with what his true intentions were and I think that he should be censured by the whole House for misleading the Members here as to what his true intentions were.

I want to talk for a moment, Mr. Speaker, about a comment that the Member for Watrous (Mr. Cody) brought up. It was regarding the Liberal promise in the last election insofar as the marketing of red meats across Canada. I have in my desk

here the promise, I'll just take a moment – I'm sorry, Mr. Speaker, I just misplaced it. In any event what the promise was, it made the promise that there should be no restrictions against red meat marketing right across this country. I would be extremely disappointed in the Members opposite if they didn't believe in that. That particular party policy was based on the fact that the Province of Quebec was attempting to put up a barrier around Quebec to prevent red meats being shipped into the province. If the Members opposite are in favor of every province in Canada putting up a trade barrier and forming us into ten different countries I would be glad if they would stand up and say so. That is exactly what the Liberal promise referred to, the famous chicken and egg war which this party did not favor and the restrictions by the various provinces regarding the transportation of meat products across provincial borders.

Now, Mr. Speaker, I want to talk for a few moments at length about the problems that the Government is bringing upon itself with their apparent intentions of imposing a marketing commission on producers whether they want it or not. I recommend to everyone here, Mr. Speaker, that it is a first class example when the Government last year instituted the Commission. It is a first class example of a Minister misleading others as to what his true intentions were of giving misleading statements to all Members of this Assembly. I am sure that had we in the Opposition at the time accused the Government of bringing forth legislation so that they could set up various Government controls by marketing commissions with no producer vote, if we had accused them of this action at that time, Government Members would have cried that we were misrepresenting their true intentions and they would have cried out long and loud. However, the Government's intention at that time is now apparent.

Marketing commissions can be set up by the Government for any farm product without the producers' consent. This was not the case ever, before the new amendment was passed in the session last year. The Government's announcement recently that no vote can be taken by hog producers has a very special significance to all other producers of any agricultural product. This, Mr. Speaker, is a precedent in this province. It is a precedent because it could be subsequently followed for many other agricultural products including cattle. It is amusing, Mr. Speaker, in listening to the Government Members one after another speak glowingly of what good things this marketing commission would do. And yet, Mr. Speaker, after dwelling on the good things they could do the most amazing thing is that they don't think that the honest-to-goodness producer is smart enough to vote 'yes' in favor of such a commission, Mr. Speaker. Surely, that is something which is an indictment of the party opposite. They've got themselves all convinced and they can cite reasons day after day, afternoon after afternoon, Mr. Speaker, but no way are they willing to concede that with all the money and all the personnel and all the people that they have at their disposal as the Government, nowhere are they once willing to concede that they can convince an honest-to-goodness hog producer that this commission would be good for him. Now, Mr. Speaker, we are quite willing and would be most pleased to accept whatever the decision is by producers in this province as to whether they have a Commission or don't, but it is unfortunate that the party opposite has decided, as the Member for Morse frequently says, to take this big brother attitude. Then, as a last resort, the party opposite, or the Government opposite backs up the Minister of Agriculture who says, "Well,

we have the backing of a number of farm organizations.” They are not willing to ask the producer whether it is a good thing or not, but “We have the backing of a number of farm organizations.”

Mr. Speaker, to that I want to make one thing extremely clear. There are a great number of farmers in this province who belong to no farm organization. They belong to no farm organization because they spend most of their time involved in their work. They are not interested in going to public meetings and fighting through resolutions year after year. They are not great public speakers and they are not anxious to go and try to put their views forward at every farm organization meeting that takes place in their local area. But these farmers are absolutely convinced, and rightly so, that they can make a decision as to whether they want a hog marketing board or not and I for one, am absolutely convinced that they should be given that kind of an opportunity. It is a good democratic principle, Mr. Speaker, that we in this Legislature practise at least once every four years. We don't tell the people of Saskatchewan that they have to go to public meetings every six months to pass resolutions or take part in anything but each time a provincial general election or a federal general election is held, no matter how little or how much any particular person participated in public affairs for that period in between, they have the right to pass judgement on electing a Member to Parliament or to the Legislature. I would suggest that this practice certainly should be followed before this board is implemented and I am convinced that if the Government has a good plan that the producers would be wise enough to vote in favor of it if they believe it is good for them.

It is obvious that the Government is afraid to go out and defend its proposals and it is ominous for other products, Mr. Speaker, that may well be included under this Act. It is obvious from the Second Reading given by the Minister at the time when the commission was brought forward last year that the words of the Government as to what future intentions are for the other products cannot be trusted.

I want to talk, Mr. Speaker, for a few minutes about the development and operation of the Alberta Hog Producers' Marketing Board. I have this publication on my desk, I recently received it. It is available, I am sure, to anyone who wishes to write to Alberta to obtain it. We are frequently told by Members opposite that there are other boards existing across Canada and they are quite correct. The most interesting thing, I think, for all of us in the formation of the Alberta Hog Producers' Marketing Board is that the very first thing they did in Alberta was they took a plebiscite to see if the producers wanted a Hog Marketing Board or not. Incidentally, the marketing board was supported in the plebiscite by a fairly large margin, subsequently the board was formed, a provincial board. Then various types of plans were voted upon and the board operates so that there are 35 directors appointed, all 35 are elected five from each of seven districts and for each of those seven districts one director is appointed. Each of seven districts in Alberta elects one man to the Board of Directors and under each one on this Board of Directors are five people representing one of the seven districts.

It is interesting to note, Mr. Speaker, that when the producers had a vote as to whether they wished to have a board or not, three types of plans were submitted to the producers,

all of which they could pass their judgement on. I think that had the Government here followed that pattern, the results would have been much more satisfactory as far as farmers throughout our province are concerned.

In the concluding comments of this publication I think it is interesting to note it says:

The primary concern of the Board is selling hogs except to act as a supervisor to ensure adequate protection of producer interests during shipment and slaughter. It does not become involved in the handling or assembly of hogs. The Board has not developed expensive assembly facilities, nor has it become involved in the delicate and controversial task of naming assembly points and truckers in conjunction with local agents. The Board expenses thus far have been kept at a minimum and producer choice of handlers has remained flexible and the Board has been able to avoid a political and perhaps unpopular struggle with a significant sector of the marketing channel.

Mr. Speaker, I think that the important aspect about the Board in Alberta is that they have a Board as the Government Members opposite support, but the producer board that exists there is not forced on producers in the manner in which the Members here of the Government wish to bring about.

Frequently, Mr. Speaker, those of us on this side of the House hear the comments that, 'Well, the Members opposite have a mandate and the mandate is 45 to 15'. Now, I don't hardly think that the last election was particularly fought on whether producers should have a vote for marketing boards or not but if they want to dwell on that type of a suggestion that they have a mandate I can mention two more things that they have a mandate for, that they haven't exactly followed through on. One was to eliminate potash pro rationing which I took from the New Deal for People. In fact, Mr. Speaker, the last action they took on that one was to go to court to make sure that the company couldn't break the law. So it would appear that they were certainly in favor of retaining it at the utmost, in fact I think they even tightened it up a little.

Well then we have the most recent example that I picked from the New Democratic Party's New Deal for People, and behold, 'we will reduce automobile insurance', and that was another promise from the New Deal for People that was part of the platform that elected 45 Members on that side.

So when we hear this crazy nonsense that they have a mandate of 45-15 they obviously have a mandate for a lot of other things that they aren't carrying out.

As one person in my constituency who said to me the week after the election, 'You know I voted for the so and so but I sure hope they don't keep all those promises they made.' I agreed with him wholeheartedly and I said 'I hope they don't keep all the promises either.'

Mr. Speaker, the Government's handling of this whole affair is discouraging, to say the least. First of all they talk and talk and tell us what a great thing it is, but it is obvious that they don't believe that they have either the

March 14, 1973

capability nor the talent to be able to convince farmers that it would be a good and successful move to obtain the same type of thing by passing a favorable vote.

This, I suggest, has ominous implications as far as other products are concerned for the future and already cattlemen are very skeptical about what the Government's intentions for the future are, and I think with excellent good cause, when you look back on the type of information that has been given to this House when this legislation was first brought to us.

It is obvious that the Government can set up a marketing board for any product they wish, with or without anyone's consent. It is also obvious that they have adopted an extremely weak position by saying that they have some farm organizations' support particularly when these farm organizations, in many respects, do not represent many producers that are bona fide producers of hogs at this time.

On this point, Mr. Speaker, I simply conclude my remarks, that this is a precedent for the Province of Saskatchewan. A bad precedent for the Province of Saskatchewan, because I believe that never in our history before has a marketing board of any nature been brought in without the consent of producers. I think it is a precedent which may not be the last by the Government opposite because of their inclination to do things in this manner.

Therefore, I suggest strongly to the Government opposite that they will not only do themselves some good, but would do a service to all producers in Saskatchewan, if they change their minds, develop two or three alternative plans, explain these plans to the producers of Saskatchewan and ask them to render decision as to whether they would prefer the Hog Marketing Board in the near future.

I think that this would be the proper approach. It is an approach used by other provinces of Canada, and I think it would be the proper approach for the Government here in the Province of Saskatchewan and it would reduce the amount of fear that is existing among many other producers of other products at this particular time.

Mr. Speaker, it is obvious that I will not be supporting the amendments that have been put before us. I beg leave to adjourn the debate.

Debate adjourned.

The Assembly adjourned at 5:21 o'clock p.m.