

LEGISLATIVE ASSEMBLY OF SASKATCHEWAN
Third Session — Seventeenth Legislature
36th Day

Thursday, March 15, 1973

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

WELCOME TO STUDENTS

Mr. Robbins (Saskatoon Nutana Centre): — Mr. Speaker, I should like to take this opportunity to introduce to you and through you to the Members of the Assembly a group of grade seven students, some 31 in number I am informed, for Victoria School in Saskatoon. The school is located in Nutana Centre constituency. They are accompanied by their teachers, Mr. Harrison and Miss Urton. I sincerely hope that the deliberations this afternoon will be edifying, educational and informative for this group.

I understand they came down by Yellow Bus Lines. I will have an opportunity to meet them about 3:15 and I hope then to answer any questions the students may put with respect to proceedings in the Assembly. I am sure we all wish them an interesting afternoon and a good trip home.

Hon. Members: — Hear, hear!

Mr. Rolfes (Saskatoon Nutana South): — Mr. Speaker, I should like to introduce to you and through you to this House a group of students from Hugh Cairns School in Saskatoon. They are grade seven students, 41 in number, and they are sitting, I believe, in the east gallery. They are accompanied by their teacher, Mr. Boden. These students, Mr. Speaker, are of particular interest to me because I know many of these students personally and also their parents. I hope that their experience here in the House will be worthwhile and that their trip to Regina and to the capital here will be long remembered in their lives.

Hon. Members: — Hear, hear!

Mr. Pepper (Weyburn): — Mr. Speaker, yesterday I had the privilege of introducing to you and through you to the Members of this House a group of grade eight students from Weyburn Junior High. Today we have a similar group of some 70 in number who, in total yesterday and today, comprise a full class of 140 grade eight students of the Weyburn Junior High School. These students, Mr. Speaker, are sitting in the west gallery. The same two teachers accompany them here this afternoon, Mr. Nedelcov and Mr. Fletcher and their bus drivers, Mr. Borshowa and Mr. Hulbert. I am sure, Mr. Speaker, that it is our wish that their journey to Regina and to the Legislative Building proves educational and that their experience here gives them further knowledge of their provincial Legislative Building and their Government in action within its walls. I am sure we all wish them a very safe journey home.

Hon. Members: — Hear, hear!

Mr. Cody (Watrous): — Mr. Speaker, I want today to introduce to you and to Members of the Assembly a group of 50 grade eight students from the Bruno School. They are seated in the east gallery and they are here today with their teachers, Randy Warick and Lyle Hassen. Mr. Speaker, Bruno, of course, is not a community which needs much introduction in this House or in Saskatchewan and not really in Canada, for that matter, because it's had its rightful share of ink in the newspapers these days. Bruno is one of the fine farming communities in the centre of my constituency of Watrous.

Mr. Speaker, I know that all Members of this Assembly wish the students and their teachers a very fine afternoon here in the Assembly watching democracy in action. We all wish them a very safe journey home.

Hon. Members: — Hear, hear!

QUESTIONS

Wounded Knee, South Dakota

Mr. MacLeod (Regina Albert Park): — Mr. Speaker, just before the Orders of the Day, I wondered if I might ask a question of the Minister of Social Services (Mr. Taylor) or the Premier (Mr. Blakeney).

It has come to my attention or it has been reported to me that the Government may have used funds to finance people to go to Wounded Knee, South Dakota and I should like to determine the accuracy of this report. I would like to ask the Minister or the Premier if any Government moneys have been used to sponsor, or pay the cost of, or the transportation of, or any other expenses in any way connected with a person going or more than one person going from Regina or Saskatchewan to Wounded Knee in the last three weeks.

Hon. Mr. Blakeney (Premier): — Mr. Speaker, so far as I am aware no Government funds have been used for that purpose. I am certainly not aware of any program or any move to expend Government funds in that way. As you may know, the Government makes unconditional grants to the Metis Society of Saskatchewan and to the Federation of Saskatchewan Indians to carry out their general functions. They list their functions under broad headings and I cannot assert positively that no funds of those organizations were used, but certainly no funds coming from the Government of Saskatchewan, so far as we are aware, have been so used, at least to my knowledge.

Mr. MacLeod: — Just a supplementary question, Mr. Speaker. I wonder if the Premier would undertake to determine whether any moneys have been so expended and I direct his attention particularly to the Department of Social Services. I observe that the Premier did not undertake to try to determine the accuracy of that report.

Hon. Mr. Blakeney: — Mr. Speaker, I think it would be better if the Hon. Member would put it on the Order Paper. I am perfectly happy to attempt to find that out. It is just a little awkward to be undertaking to deal with oral questions in this way. But

specifically the answer is yes, I will try to find out. I would request, as a matter of convenience to us and to the House that the Member put it on the Order Paper.

Grant To Moose Jaw Board of Education

Mr. MacDonald (Moose Jaw North): — Mr. Speaker, a question to the Minister of Education. The Board of Education in Moose Jaw has brought in a preliminary budget calling for an \$130,000 deficit for the coming year which would either be a deficit or a mill increase of four mills. They have indicated that their expenditures will be up \$200,000 or four per cent over last year and that the provincial grant will be up \$50,000 or an increase of two per cent over that they got last year. Would the Minister say whether this grant is the final word to the City of Moose Jaw or will he undertake to review the grant that he is giving them?

Mr. MacMurchy (Minister of Education): — Mr. Speaker, the list of grants, moneys that have gone out to boards are estimated grants for the coming year. I think that is traditional. If there are changes in enrolments, for instance, over the period of the year, then there will be changes in the grants, particularly an upward trend if there is an upward increase in enrolment. But that would be the final figure. Now there may be some mistakes as far as calculating the grant and if the board feels that they would like to meet with me, with my staff to discuss the grants we are certainly willing to do that. They fit into the formula which was debated and discussed in the House last year. I indicated some changes during the Budget Speech Debate and they have fitted into the formula and the grant, as we have indicated to them, will be their grant in an estimated form.

Advertising Improperly Done by Government

Mr. Steuart (Leader of the Opposition): — Mr. Speaker, before the Orders of the Day, a few days ago I raised a question and I brought into the House and tabled the March issue, or part of the March issue, of a little publication called "Saskatchewan Light and Power" in which there was an ad placed by the provincial Department of Agriculture advising people of the deadline to apply for the lease of certain lands and the deadline was February 15, two weeks earlier. Today I have a copy of the Leader-Post, a final notice put out by SaskTel stating that the alphabetical or white pages of the Regina City Telephone Directory will close and the deadline is March 2. They advise people to act now if they want to make any changes and it happens to be the March 12 issue of the Regina Leader-Post. Now I might question the Premier, is this waste of money, and this is only two instances, are these the result of the stupidity of their eastern advertising agency, Dunskey, or it is the result of just the natural stupidity of the Government in wasting taxpayers' money? I wonder if he could give us the answer.

Hon. Mr. Blakeney (Premier): — Mr. Speaker, I know that the Member opposite is much more familiar than I with the stupidities of eastern advertising agencies.

March 15, 1973

Some Hon. Members: — Hear, hear!

Hon. Mr. Blakeney: — I am certainly not aware of the reason for that advertisement. It may be the stupidity of our staff, it may be the stupidity of the Leader-Post. I suspect that all of these people, including ourselves, have showed ourselves capable of some fair amount of stupidity and we will try to find out at whose door we should lay this particular piece.

Hon. Mr. Messer (Minister of Agriculture): — Mr. Speaker, with reference to the Leader of the Opposition's question pertaining to Light and Power, my staff did look into the script that was submitted to the Farm Light and Power publication and in our script the deadline was March 15 and an error had been made in setting of the type. It was not an error that emanated from the Department of Agriculture in regard to that particular ad.

Mr. Steuart: — If we can just nail this one to the stupidity of the Leader-Post, we've got it made, haven't we?

MOTION

House to Pay Tribute to Silver Broom World Curling Champions

Hon. Mr. Blakeney (Premier): — Mr. Speaker, I wonder if I may ask leave of the Assembly to introduce a motion, seconded by the Hon. Attorney General (Mr. Romanow) and I believe with the consent of the Opposition:

Ordered, that when this Assembly adjourns today it shall stand adjourned until tomorrow at 3:15 o'clock p.m. so that this Assembly may pay tribute to the curling champions of Canada, Denmark, France, German, Italy, Norway, Scotland, Sweden, Switzerland and the United States, who are participating in the Silver Broom International Curling Championship in Regina.

Mr. Speaker, the reason for this Motion is, I think, clear. After consultation with the Opposition, it was thought fitting that this Legislature take a few moments to pay tribute to our international visitors. The method suggested by the Clerk would be that we might do it tomorrow at normal commencement time of 2:30 and set aside 45 minutes; perhaps 15 or 20 minutes will be taken for some brief words of welcome from myself or of the Opposition or someone representing the Opposition's side, and presumably a reply on behalf of our international visitors. At that point we would have an opportunity to mingle with and meet personally our visitors from these many lands. They then would withdraw and we will assume our ordinary business at 3:15 or thereabouts. That's the proposal. I believe it is a fitting way for us to acknowledge our visitors and express a fitting way for us to acknowledge our visitors and express to them our welcome. Accordingly, I move the motion which I just read.

Motion agreed to.

ADJOURNED DEBATES

SECOND READINGS

The Assembly resumed the adjourned debate on the proposed motion by the Hon. Mr. Smishek (Minister of Health) that Bill No. 67 – **An Act to amend The Cancer Control Act** be now read a second time.

Mr. Grant (Regina Whitmore Park): — Mr. Speaker, first of all I should like to comment favorably on the manner in which the Minister spoke to this Bill because he did it in a non-political way and I think this is commendable because the Cancer Control in this province has seen experience under various governments and, I think, is recognized as one of the most successful Cancer Control programs in the world. It has a long and enviable record and I certainly won't add anything to cause a political fire.

It was felt two or three years ago that after the Cancer Commission and The Cancer Control Act had been in operation for some 40 years, that it needed some review and some reassessment and some revaluation, and that possibly as a result of that study and review that it could play a more vital role than it had in the past. It is interesting to note that the President of the United States not too long ago indicated an all-out battle against cancer in the United States and gave many, many millions of dollars of support to the American Cancer Society. Here in Canada we haven't declared the same all-out war on a Canadian basis, although the Canadian Cancer Society has been active for many, many years and I believe the Minister mentioned that it had its founding in Saskatchewan. I think there is a debt of gratitude coming to the thousands of volunteers in the Cancer Society for the millions of dollars they have raised throughout the 25 odd years they have been in existence. I think it is an indication of the status of that association when one realizes that year in and year out they have been able to exceed their quota of funds that they put a drive on for.

It's regrettable that due to the calibre of the people engaged on the Johnson Commission and the size of the task that we gave those people – when I say the calibre I have reference to the fact that they were all very busy people – that it took a little longer to complete than we have originally intended. But when one looks at the report, it is quite a voluminous document of some 179 pages with 71 recommendations and it was put together by people under the chairmanship of Mr. Justice Johnson. Judge Johnson, being a member of the Queen's Bench Court is a very busy man, but his right-hand men were equally busy and I refer to Mr. Harry Bower who is the provincial manager of the Royal Bank, Doctor Walton, director of the Manitoba Cancer Foundation, Doctor Taylor, a prominent surgeon, and Bob Genereaux, a consulting engineer here in Regina and one other one, Mr. Harold Dietrich, a lawyer.

The result of almost two years work, I think, has brought forth an excellent report and as the Minister indicated quite a number of the recommendations are being implemented and I would hope that as time goes on the Department and the newly formed commission can see fit to implement some of the other recommendations.

There is one gentleman involved in the work of the Cancer Control in this province that I think bears special mention and I refer to Doctor Tom Barclay who has been executive director for quite a number of years but in the last year or so has carried a very heavy load in that he was covering Saskatoon as well as Regina. It must be a pretty onerous occupation for him and I'm sure all Members of this House appreciate his contribution.

The important thing, I think, which was brought forth in this Act is the make-up of the board and the powers given to that board and a feature that I like very much, namely a built-in turnover plan so that there will be a change of personnel on the board as times goes on.

I think there is some merit in the thought of a full-time chairman, because it is a demanding job and the new role, or the new powers and purposes will be such that a chairman, even if he is only part-time, can make a big contribution to the future of Cancer Control in this province.

One other observation — the Minister made reference to the betatron which has been installed in Saskatoon and it is unique I think that this is only about the second one in North America and I think we should also remember it was unique in the manner in which we acquired it, in that we bartered grain for it, just in case some of us may have forgotten that business manoeuvre.

Mr. Speaker, I don't wish to prolong the debate, I merely want to endorse what the Minister said and publicly acknowledge the contribution made by Mr. Justice Johnson and his committee in a very worthwhile task and I know we all wish the future of the cancer program in Saskatchewan success and that success will be the day when we find the answer to this scourge.

Hon. Mr. Smishek (Minister of Public Health): — Mr. Speaker, I want to express my appreciation and thanks to the Members of the Opposition for their endorsement of the amendments that are being proposed to The Cancer Control Act.

Perhaps the question that the Hon. Member from Moose Jaw raised was answered by the Member from Whitmore Park. The other day he raised the question on the term appointments i.e. limiting them to three years and permitting a further three year appointment. I am glad to see that the Hon. Member from Whitmore Park does endorse the idea. Perhaps he might get together with the Hon. Member from Moose Jaw who seemed to question the idea when he spoke in the debate.

I have already expressed my thanks and appreciation to the members of the Johnson Commission both in a personal way and by way of letter. We do appreciate the contribution made by the members of the Johnson Commission who studied the cancer program and who made a number of very useful recommendations. The other day I said the recommendations in a majority of cases can only be acted on by the program development and do not require legislative changes. Those legislative changes that are necessary are being made in the Bill. We do hope that with changes in the membership of the commission we can again give new impetus to the Cancer Control program.

May I also say that we are faced with some problems particularly in the need of expert physicians, radio-therapists, where there is a shortage. I'm glad to see that our recruitment program has had some success. My information is that four radio-therapists are coming to Saskatchewan. We now have three radio-therapists in the province. When you consider that in the whole of Western Canada there are only twelve radio-therapists we can consider ourselves fortunate in relation to other provinces. It is because we have had a meaningful program but I think that the program does need some new life.

With those few words, Mr. Speaker, 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 by the Hon. Mr. MacMurchy that Bill No. 66 – **An Act respecting Community Colleges** be now read a second time.

Mr. Tchorzewski (Minister of Culture and Youth): — Mr. Speaker, I adjourned the debate yesterday because as I said I knew that there were other Members who wanted to speak in this debate.

I closed by saying, Mr. Speaker, that I thought that this innovation and this concept that is being developed in community colleges in Saskatchewan is going to serve as an example, I believe, to other jurisdictions in Canada in the development or the improvement of their community college systems.

I think that you can look at the places, as I mentioned the other day, and the mistakes that have been made in places like Ontario, where the community colleges are no longer continuing to be, in fact, community colleges but have become campuses geared mainly to a campus situation rather than serving communities.

In Saskatchewan because we have had the benefit of being able to see the errors that were made in other jurisdictions. We have been able to develop a program which will, in fact, really and truly serve the communities where they are and serve the people in their communities by having programs that are of interest and are of need to them, offered to them in the communities in which they live rather than having to travel any kind of long distances to be able to take advantage of these programs.

Mr. Speaker, as I said yesterday, I will be very happy, and I can say this for the people in my constituency, or part of one of the community college pilot projects, I'm very happy to support this Bill which, as I said before, is very significant and is going to be another milestone in the development of educational programs and educational systems in Saskatchewan.

Some Hon. Members: — Hear, hear!

Hon. Mr. Kowalchuk (Melville): — Mr. Speaker, I, too, should like to add a few comments to the already goodly number of speeches that have been made in this regard to this Bill, Bill 66, an Act respecting Community Colleges.

The need in the communities for a program of education other than that being offered by the regular school system has, in the past decade, been recognized not only by those providing the education, including teachers, trustees and other people but the many working people mostly adults who need refresher courses and varied other people who make up the community. Now these people realize that to be a part of today's mechanical and technological world and, of course, Mr. Speaker, to add to the enrichment of life across our province, particularly to the rural life, educational programs had to arise based on formal and informal needs of each separate community. Thus, the idea of the community colleges was born, hopefully, far different from the community colleges of the North American past which for all purposes became glorified high schools or glorified colleges or often pint size spitting images of the big brother, the university. Now the community college of Saskatchewan will, in fact, be the community.

Mr. Speaker, the clearly definitive idea of this concept is that the college is the community and the community is the college. This indeed is a very accurate description of the proposed community colleges in Saskatchewan.

What I like about this program of community colleges, Mr. Speaker, is that it's the community that determines whether it wishes to have any courses, formal or informal, that it's the community having established the need for a course, decides all the particulars about it, when it will be held, where it will be held and all other matters relating to it. It's autonomy the kind that I like, Mr. Speaker. It's the kind of autonomy and grassroots participation that I believe in and I am certain will be approved by the local communities, those that will have community colleges within their vicinity.

The communities and the individuals within it will influence the make-up of the college and the make-up of its courses as I've already said. The people will be able to identify the needs of the community by program decision making. Changing needs and changing concerns will determine the kind of programs they will have. Mr. Speaker.

Another important factor in this college concept is that the people will use their resources that they have at hand. They are free to move the classroom to a factory or to a farm, if that's what they want. There is no rigidity of classroom curriculum. The lessons may be learned on the spot, so to speak, and in my opinion that is an excellent change from the strictly formal lecture methods that are so overworn and overused in our lecture halls of today.

Furthermore, Mr. Speaker, to use the physical facilities as they are without further expansion or money or further construction of buildings will meet with the approval of school boards, ratepayers and people in general, I'm sure.

As a former trustee, I, as well as many other trustees, have often said, why should these buildings be used only forty hours a week, why not use them for as many daylight hours as possible? Why not use them at night, why should we not have adults using these costly facilities as well as regular students? This utilization of the school facilities by community colleges is a step in the right direction, Mr. Speaker.

Now four project areas have been established in Saskatchewan as has been said by the other Members on this side of the House. Each is to begin operation in the fall of 1973 – LaRonge, Humboldt, Swift Current and Yorkton-Melville. Because the Yorkton-Melville work has already progressed to a point, I want to make a few comments about it.

First, let me say that the Yorkton-Melville area is an area of the province that is, in my personal opinion, very much suited to a community college program. It's a very diverse area geographically and culturally as I have often said before. People in that area have been asking for information about community colleges, how a community is to go about sponsoring these, who qualifies for these programs, how they are paid for and many other questions. Ever since the opening of the office in Melville approximately two months ago, the community college developer has been continuously out in the field meeting the people, asking questions, talking to municipal people, service clubs, church groups, community groups and other groups of people that show interest are being visited by him. Then, of course there are those people who don't meet with the developer and they deal through the office and the office secretary has a continual stream of people to deal with and also many replies to answer by phone and by mail.

By the interest being shown, Mr. Speaker, the community college program can certainly look forward to a strong community participation in that region in the community college concept.

Mr. Speaker, the regulations regarding the composition of the board as written in this Bill, in my opinion, are quite flexible and indeed they should. The rule that points out the fact that all board members would have to reside in the area served by the college is further evidence of homemade participation and homemade organization. The local board chooses the principal who is also the chief executive officer. One of the board members, of which there could be a total of four to seven, could be a student, one member would be from the teaching staff. A yearly proposed budget would have to be submitted to the Continuing Education Department and a report on the college's operation and financing would have to be submitted annually as well.

Mr. Speaker, hopefully the community college concept will serve to bring education to the people in the community than as it has been where much of the formal education has been away from the community. It will provide the kind of courses the community wants and needs as I've indicated before. It will benefit every interested person regardless of his previous education or his background. A fairly good example of similar types of training are the short courses offered by Manpower, the Extension Department of the University, the Co-op Credit Society and others have shown that indeed there is a void in the community educational structure that could be filled by these organizations and that the community college concept can easily become the leader to this end.

Mr. Speaker, this is a Bill that I am certain will be the vehicle which will enable communities to determine in their own way a new grassroots participatory method of education. In view of the fact that many older people desire to participate in the process of learning, that many younger people are

March 15, 1973

searching for knowledge tied closer to their needs, and that the concept of the structuring of this ideal of community colleges must come from the communities themselves which eventually builds up and strengthens the community itself, I am in full agreement of the Bill as I'm sure will be all other Members of this House.

Some Hon. Members: — Hear, hear!

Hon. Mr. Mostoway (Hanley): — Mr. Speaker, I, too, think this is a very good Bill. I have some things that I want to say on it at a little later date and right now I beg leave to adjourn the debate.

Debate adjourned.

ADJOURNED DEBATES

MOTIONS

Rail Line Abandonment

The Assembly resumed the adjourned debate on the proposed motion moved by the Hon. Mr. Blakeney:

That this Assembly urges the Federal Government that no railway branch line abandonment be considered in Saskatchewan before all the alternatives are thoroughly studied and the social and economic costs to producers, businesses and communities be ascertained and, further, that no abandonments be allowed without the prior agreement of the Government of Saskatchewan and, specifically, that no abandonments be authorized until 1980.

And the proposed amendment thereto by Mr. Gardner:

That the following words be added to the motion:

“and further that the railroad companies be obligated to:

1. Provide a high standard of service on present lines.
2. Provide adequate maintenance and improvements on rail lines and equipment so that a high standard of service can be maintained.”

Hon. Mr. Romanow (Attorney General): — Mr. Speaker, I should like to say a few words about this particular resolution. The resolution is a very important one for the Province of Saskatchewan dealing with the matter of rail line abandonment. The resolution is important because if it passes this House, as I anticipate it will, it will have the effect of communicating to the Federal Government authorities and to the railways, inasmuch as they are involved, the united voice of the Saskatchewan people on the matter of rail line abandonment.

Rail line abandonment in a wholesale way will have a tremendous impact on the economic and social lives of the people of the Province of Saskatchewan. The economics of the situation are very clear. If rail lines are abandoned we can expect, naturally as a result, closure of country elevators. As a consequence of that we can expect that our farmers will have to look to alternate methods of hauling grain to market and to points where it can be delivered to market. This will undoubtedly mean trucking. It will mean an increased

expenditure in terms of the truck units that will have to be bought by them. It will mean, undoubtedly, on the part of the Provincial Government increased expenditures on highways in order to carry those trucks and that, indirectly, at any rate, comes right back onto the farmers. It will mean, as well, longer distances to haul and that, of course, means increased costs in terms of gasoline and in terms of man hours and so forth and the economic ramifications multiply.

From a social standpoint rail line abandonment is an equally serious threat to the people of Saskatchewan. In the Province of Saskatchewan over the last several years we have seen almost on a day to day basis announcements of closures of a variety of functions in our small towns and villages which are an integral part of our Saskatchewan way of life.

An example is the closure of post offices now followed by applications by Canadian Pacific and Canadian National Railways over a four or five year period for massive closures of stations and removal of agents. Small towns in Saskatchewan, in my experience, quite naturally view each one of these closures as the beginning of an end for a way of life for a community which has been such a part of the Saskatchewan scene. And if you see rail line abandonment added on top of this, Mr. Speaker, and you see the closure of country elevator points coupled on top of closures of post offices and station agents and the like, the tendency for larger and larger farming units, one can see that this trend to centralization will have profound social effects on the face of Saskatchewan.

I think it is incumbent on all of us as MLAs, as interested citizens in the future economic and social development of our province, to ask ourselves the basic question: Do we want Saskatchewan to organize itself economically and socially in larger centralized units with respect to the family farms, which I submit means fewer family farms, a few large family farms, which means fewer towns and villages, which means a smaller rural based population, which means, in effect, a centralization, a concentration of economic and social activity in several larger centres of the Province of Saskatchewan.

Do we want that for the Province of Saskatchewan in 1975 or 1980? Can MLAs say, well, we don't want it but it is inevitable? Should the people of Saskatchewan adopt the attitude that there is nothing that can be done to stop the wave of technology that the CPR and the CN placed upon the people of this province, that it is inevitable? Do we as MLAs say that the costs of production, the costs of keeping the family farmer are such that it is impossible to keep the family farmers as basic to the scene of the Province of Saskatchewan, that it is inevitable? Inevitable that we are all going to move to a trend of bigness, a trend of increasing centralization, a trend to larger and larger units?

If we say that it is inevitable, that it is more efficient, that technology demands that of us, we start from that sort of philosophical base, then I submit that we are conceding as MLAs that Saskatchewan as we have known it sooner or later, and I submit very much sooner, will go by the board, that we don't want to preserve the social and other institutions which are the basic framework of the Province of Saskatchewan.

I, for one, Mr. Speaker, don't want to see that. I, for one,

want to approach my analysis of the problems of station closures, of rail line abandonment, of closures of post office, the business of larger farms, I want to approach it with the bias that there is a social goal worth preserving. That there must be some very strong overriding economic reasons, overpowering economic reasons to convince me that the Province of Saskatchewan's rural face should be changed and chanted so radically before I accept it.

Some Hon. Members: — Hear, hear!

Hon. Mr. Romanow: — For the Canadian Pacific and the Canadian National railroads, for some of the people who are associated with them and in the involvements with respect to grain handling and the like, quite obviously, there are powerful economic reasons for rail line abandonment.

When you are a marketing supervisor or an operations manager, or a vice president or even a president of Canadian Pacific or Canadian National the one thing that you have to look at is the profit and loss balance statement and unfortunately that statement doesn't show the social and political objectives that all of us MLAs should be striving for in this Province of Saskatchewan.

Unfortunately the history of this province has been that when the CPR and the CN sit down in their corporate board rooms and corporate tables to judge what is going to happen in future economic development for the Province of Saskatchewan the social concerns are totally non-existent. And there has been no one in the past from Government or from communities to bring to the attention of the railways what that social cause and what those economic objectives of our province are.

In the few short months that I had anything to do with railways and transportation policies, Mr. Speaker, nothing has frustrated me more than the attitude of the Canadian Pacific and Canadian National railways. It is not to say that they are not pleasant or courteous or well informed and, in fact, very often can mount what at first sight would seem to be strong arguments for increasing centralization. But nothing, generally speaking, Mr. Speaker, has frustrated me more than dealing with the railways of the country of Canada, railways which have long ago abandoned their stated objective in history, in any event, of being the nation builders of this country.

What happened is the concept that the Canadian National and the Canadian Pacific were, contrary to all of the aspects of geography that almost compel us to go north-south in our trading, north-south in our culture, north-south in our economics, in order to counter that, the railways were to be used and to be the nation builders, east-west against geographic odds. What happened to the idea that railway companies had more than just a duty to their shareholders to produce a profit? What happened to the idea that railway companies were there not only to provide efficient transportation but were there as an instrument of national unity or of the interests of Canada, even those here in Western Canada which is small in population and economically and in many ways dependent on Eastern Canada.

What happened, Mr. Speaker, is that the entire philosophy has been lost in the corporate board rooms of the Canadian

Pacific and the Canadian National. They have the ear of those agencies, those instruments of government federally, which are sympathetic to that point of view. There is no one to speak from Western Canada for the family farmer, for the small village, for the way of life that all of us on this side of the House want to preserve in the Province of Saskatchewan.

Some Hon. Members: — Hear, hear!

Hon. Mr. Romanow: — Mr. Speaker, one way that we can in a non-partisan way speak in the interests of all of the people in this province, and I say to a large extent in the interests of Canada, is by passing this resolution and passing the amendment to the resolution which I think strengthens the intent of the resolution.

I say to the Opposition that little is achieved with speeches about rail line abandonment in 1962 to 1964. Little is achieved by speeches as have been delivered by Members opposite accusing this Government of introducing this resolution as a political ploy. Little is achieved by contradictory speeches on the opposite side which condemns farm organizations out-of-hand or almost seemingly out-of-hand for their position on rail line abandonment.

I don't think there are necessarily blacks and whites in the situation. And if we communicate to the people of Saskatchewan that this resolution is nothing more, nothing less than a political ploy, I am saying that those who would argue that, are only doing one thing and that is communicating to the railways that we are not standing united. And if we don't stand united on this, divided we will fall. That is a disservice to the farmers of Saskatchewan.

Some Hon. Members: — Hear, hear!

Hon. Mr. Romanow: — Mr. Speaker, this problem is a problem of long standing history in the Province of Saskatchewan. In 1962, 1963, 1964, 1965 the whole matter of transportation was again rearing its head by way of proposed legislation.

The Government of the day in 1964 and 1971 was, of course, the Liberal Government. The Liberal Government of that day endeavored to do some things with respect to rail line abandonment. I give them credit for that. But it is my contention, Mr. Speaker, that there were two or three major areas of failure during those years of 1964 to 1971 which placed the Province of Saskatchewan now in a very difficult predicament.

In my judgement, perusing the documentation that I have had an opportunity to look at, one failure was the bias which the Liberal Party of the day had toward the 1967 National Transportation Act. Mr. Speaker, you will know that in 1967 a new National Transportation Act under which certain rights and certain grievances can be remedied was written for Canada. That National Transportation Act was based on the philosophy that rail rates and that rail lines and rail service could be maintained on the principle of competition, competition of one mode of transport versus another.

March 15, 1973

I believe that the Liberal Government, those Members who were Members of that Government sitting opposite, in their belief in the principle of competition supported that general approach in 1967. And in so doing they failed to recognize a major gap in the principle of competition as a means of controlling this problem in Western Canada, namely, that there is no competition for the farmer and for the shipper of this province. Namely, that trucks in this western part of Canada are dominated by the rails, that our trucking industry is very small, that in all forms of transport we are controlled by the rails which act in a monopolistic fashion.

But on the matter of rail lines, more specifically, Mr. Speaker, I think that the errors of the former administration were, in fact, very glaring in two or three areas which makes it very difficult now for us to cope with the problem.

First of all, this matter of maintenance. I think the amendment is a good amendment. I urge all Members of the House to support it. But I want to remind the Members of this House that it was during the period of 1967 to 1971 approximately that the railways decided to adopt their policy of non-maintenance of rail lines as a part of their case build-up prior to 1967 for rail line abandonment. Part of their approach was to be that rail lines were in disrepair and disuse and that therefore the rail lines should be abandoned.

I want this House to know that I know of no record of written contact by the former Government on this issue of rail line maintenance when the matter was, in fact, the policy of the railways from 1964 to 1971. Now they introduce the amendment. And, of course, I say I welcome that but the fact of the matter is that in 1973 it is very difficult for us to counteract, after periods of several years of non-maintenance, non-maintenance which buttresses the argument for rail line abandonment by the railways.

Now there is a second problem. Mr. Speaker, I put it in these terms. On May 4, 1967, that is now six years ago and in the middle of the Liberal regime, this whole matter of rail line abandonment finally came to a resolution. On May 4, 1967 the Federal Government, a Federal Liberal Government passed an Order-in-Council which guaranteed much of the prairie rail network to January 1, 1975. So that as of that date the politicians in Western Canada could feel, I think they felt secure, that to January 1, 1975 much of the rail line network would be protected.

But, Mr. Speaker, there was short run relief only in that May 4, 1967 Federal Liberal Government decision. What has been the result? First, the Provincial Liberal Government on May 4, 1967 and thereafter failed to recognize the threat of massive rail line abandonment after January 1, 1975. Somehow the Government of the day felt that 1975 was an eternity away. It was at least eight years away. It would at least get them by the provincial election of October 1967. It would at least tell the farmers of Saskatchewan as they went into the provincial election of October 1967 that rail lines were now protected by virtue of the Order-in-Council of May 4, 1967. And because they weren't concerned about 1975 and beyond, the result, Mr. Speaker, was that when we took office no major policy was being developed as to what this Government was going to do for Western Canada after 1975. That was, I think, one of the major errors of the

party opposite.

A second failure, to my judgement, is also very significant. After this Order-in-Council was passed in 1967 Members will know that the Grains Group was established to study this problem of rail line abandonment and the delivery system of the whole of Western Canada, country elevators and the like which is all tied into it. That was established in 1969.

Mr. Speaker, I can find no steps taken by the former Government wherein they asked to participate in any such studies. Mr. Speaker, I can find no evidence from the former Government to show that the voice of the Saskatchewan farmer would be heard in that 1969 study which obviously had huge ramifications now for all of the economic and social fabric of Western Canada. To me it is inconceivable that a Provincial Government which had an ally at that time in the Liberal Government in Ottawa instrumental in setting up the Grains Group knowing that the likely consequences were going to be of immense proportion economically and socially. To me it is inconceivable that somehow the voice of the Government of Saskatchewan was not to play a part in that, not only not to play a part but there was not even an attempt that the voice of the prairie farmer should be heard.

Some Hon. Members: — Hear, hear!

Hon. Mr. Romanow: — And what was the result, Mr. Speaker, and what do we face now in 1973? The result was the Grains Groups was set up as everybody knows. It worked in virtual secrecy. It worked up until about October or November of 1971 with virtually no input from any Provincial Government that I know of. It has input from some of the farm organizations, the Wheat Pool, the rails and a few other commodity groups. But there was no input from the elected representatives of the people. There was no input from 1969 to 1971 from the Liberals opposite. And when we got into power and I went down to talk to a few people with respect to the Grains Group I was told there wasn't going to be any input and it wasn't until the Minister of Agriculture (Mr. Messer), the Premier (Mr. Blakeney) and several others and other circumstances which forced a rethinking on the part of the Grains Group that the result was that the report was given to us in confidence in late 1971. But the point is, Mr. Speaker, that we were given the findings, we were presented with the findings. We weren't given a chance to work towards those findings. And what is happening now? We see here railway companies in some areas, even our farm organizations working in concert with the railway companies. We see a possibility of shrinkage in lines and shrinkage in country elevators in their economic interest and a buildup in Western Canada of propaganda to brainwash the farmers of this province and Western Canada that rail rationalization, country elevator schemes, abandonment and the like are in the best interests, socially and economically, of this province.

The Province of Saskatchewan's voice was silent in 1969 and beyond.

Now there is a third point also, Mr. Speaker, that I want to draw to the attention of the Members. I said that the May 4, 1967 Order-in-Council ended rail line abandonment proposals to 1975. But the key word to the Member from Moose Jaw North

March 15, 1973

(Mr. MacDonald) is that much, not all, but much of the rail lines are protected. What is important in the May 4, 1967 Order-in-Council of protection is that it didn't protect, Mr. Speaker. It didn't protect 1,010 miles of rail lines in the Province of Saskatchewan. And the situation simply is that today there are 1,010 miles or over 1,000 miles lying still unprotected by that Order-in-Council of 1967. Mr. Speaker, the railway companies could by law abandon these lines. They have refrained from doing so because they say that the Grains Group investigation must be in before they will act on what they legally can do now on those 1,010 miles of rail lines.

Mr. Speaker, this is not a comprehensive list but if those 1,010 miles of lines, if the railways pick up their legal right to act, they are affecting 126 elevator points in Saskatchewan. They are affecting 255 elevators. They are affecting, roughly speaking, 7,500 permit holders, 7,500 farmers of the province. They are, in effect, affecting 14 million bushels in elevator storage capacity which could be lost. They are affecting our villages, our hamlets and our town residents nearly 10,000 in number, Mr. Speaker. That is the effect of 1,010 miles of rail lines left unprotected, basically at the mercy of the railway companies.

Mr. Speaker, I say that the former Liberal Government erred seriously when they didn't bring to the attention of the Federal Government, their political allies, that there were over 1,000 miles of rail lines left unprotected. They erred in not bringing to the attention of the Federal Government the concerns of those 10,000 people, the concerns of those 7,500 permit holders, the concerns of those elevator points, concern for the entire social and economic fabric of the Province of Saskatchewan.

Where were the Liberals in 1967 on rail line abandonment? That was when the basic policy decisions were being made. Where were the Liberals provincially? Where were the Liberals federally, Mr. Speaker? In fact, for that matter, I don't believe that there was any statement by any Federal Liberal politician on rail line abandonment until the recently concluded federal election in October of 1972. I don't think there was a statement prior to October 1972. Can anybody think of one by a federal politician?

Some Hon. Members: — No!

Hon. Mr. Romanow: — Not one! And what happened in October of 1972 was that the Prime Minister realized that he was in political trouble in Western Canada. The Member from Regina shrugs as if that statement is untrue. Nothing could prove the truth of that statement more than the result of October 31, 1972. I mean if he didn't think he was in political trouble at that time, surely, he must have realized that he was in that two or three week period from the time he made the statement to the time the vote was taken that something went wrong because the Liberal popularity went completely down. I don't want to get side-tracked on that issue.

I am only saying, Mr. Speaker, that is the first time that I can recall that there has been a move by Federal Liberal politicians in this area. The Prime Minister said that there would be no rail line abandonment without the prior consultation

of the Governments of Saskatchewan and those provinces affected. And that is the basis for this resolution because he said it in print and publicly and we want this House to stand united with respect to this position.

Mr. Speaker, I close my remarks as I started them. I think this resolution contains a fundamental question about how we want Saskatchewan to develop for the future. I invite the Liberals to join us in saying that there is a way of life, that there is a system that has served not only Canada but the world very well as the bread basket. It is a system socially and economically that we must work to protect. We invite them to join us in declaring that we can't as legislators preside over the destruction and decimation of Western Canada but rather we want to be the builders of family farms in Western Canada and not to be those who have been elected to see them disappear and small towns and villages die as well. I think this will be the consequence of the massive abandonment as is contemplated now.

I want to hasten to add the position of the Government is not to say that no line can be abandoned. We all know that there are some lines which from every standpoint, the political objective, the economic and the social objective, and I don't mean political in a partisan sense, should be abandoned. And there will have to be a rationalization of the country delivery system. I commend the Pools and the farm organizations for studying this matter and involving their membership. We, as the Government of Saskatchewan aren't adopting the attitude like ostriches with their heads in the sand that nothing must ever change. If there is any such misconception, let me dispel that notion.

In fact, we are studying this matter very actively, the Minister of Agriculture (Mr. Messer) has the former Deputy Minister of Agriculture, Mr. Horner working full time on rail line abandonment, its economic and social effects. We say that if an alternate service is needed by way of trucking, the costs to the farmers and to the communities in Western Canada must first be determined before any steps are taken. We say that as a Saskatchewan Government we want a voice and an input before rail lines are to be abandoned. We need until 1980 to analyze the problem. Not that 1980 is any magic date. We think the problem is of such immense importance that we need that amount of time in order to adjust our thinking, in order to adjust our farm organizations, in order to make all the necessary adjustments so that the people of Saskatchewan get as good if not better service than they had earned in the past. That is what this resolution says. I urge all Members of this House to support the amendment and to support the main motion, to put aside political comment, to rise above the matter of partisan points of view as have been enunciated by the Member from Lumsden (Mr. Lane) and the Member for Rosthern (Mr. Boldt) and to get on with the job making sure that Western Canada has a strong, healthy and vital role to play for all of Canada. I am going to support both the amendment and the resolution.

Some Hon. Members: — Hear, hear!

Mr. MacDonald (Moose Jaw North): — Mr. Speaker, I hadn't intended to get into this

debate but I think that following the Attorney General (Mr. Romanow) possibly there will be a few more people wanting to enter the debate. The Attorney General didn't disappoint us. He came out with his usual contradictory and grandstand style. He continually urged this House that we must not stand divided, that we must put our politics aside and then he discussed nothing but politics for the whole speech. He urges us to put politics aside and then spends 15 minutes talking politics. Where were the Liberals, he said, and what were they doing and what they didn't do and how they erred. He asks us to put politics aside, that we must stand united. It is the kind of contradiction that we have come to expect from the Attorney General and that we get every time that we hear him.

I was a little disappointed in his style today. He only attracted 15 Members from his side of the House and one of the occupants of the gallery is still asleep. He said that the attitude of the CPR and the CNR is a little frustrating at times, and I will agree. But the attitude of the NDP opposite is frustrating all the time. He talked that political speeches and political resolutions won't do any good. This is the only thing that the NDP has ever tried. He talked about the public hearings that the NDP had in the early 1960s. This is just a political ploy. At the same time these public meetings were being held the NDP hoped that rail lines would be abandoned so they could blame the Federal Government and use it as a political issue. I think they may be doing the same today. The NDP keep coming up with a short-sighted and narrow attitude towards the questions of rail line abandonment and the present resolution is the same. Government Members should realize that no lines were ever abandoned except under an NDP Government. That is a well known fact in this and to put a short-sighted motion on these books that says that no more, nothing until 1980 and then I suppose it is all right what ever happens. That is not the right kind of a motion. The right kind of a motion is the amendment that offers some solutions to the problem. I don't think that the Attorney General can expect this House to be united with the Members of this House until a resolution is offered that is a little more far-sighted. I think that he should talk to the farmers. The farmers aren't as short-sighted as this. Farm organizations aren't as short-sighted as this resolution is. Ask the Wheat Pool if you went to the meeting last Friday in Saskatoon. Farmers aren't even talking with this type of an attitude.

Mr. Speaker, I think that after the remarks of the Attorney General I should like to ask leave to adjourn the debate.

Debate adjourned.

ADJOURNED DEBATES

SECOND READINGS

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.

Hon. Mr. Michayluk (Redberry): — Debates on Bill 50, The Natural Products Marketing Act have gone on for some time. The Minister of Agriculture

and the Members who have participated thus far have put forward some arguments for support of or opposition to this legislation. The Hon. Members who spoke in support demonstrated with convincing facts in favor of orderly marketing of natural products and particularly for the establishment of the Hog Marketing Commission to create permanency with respect to the price and sale of the hogs produced in Saskatchewan.

The Hon. Member for Rosthern (Mr. Boldt), who is not in his seat, Mr. Speaker, in his far ranging rhetoric kept swinging from his usual position of the extreme right to the unusual left in support of the Canadian Wheat Board. He remarked that the farmers were the hardest up under the Wheat Board up until the initial price of wheat went up to \$1.70 per bushel.

To the Hon. Member from Rosthern, Mr. Speaker, the word compulsory is a very repulsive word. Might I be permitted to pose several pointed questions to the Hon. Member from Rosthern? By making specific reference to the seven years when the Hon. Member was in the Executive Council and the Treasury Benches, was there no compulsion in the legislation under Bill 2? Was there no compulsion in Medicare and hospital deterrent fees? Was there no compulsion in the five per cent tax on meals? Was there no compulsion in levying hospital charges on estates of the unfortunate Saskatchewan residents who died while institutionalized in our mental institutions? It appears to me that the Hon. Member wants to wash his political linens white in very muddy and dirty Liberal water. Mr. Speaker, he made reference that this Government is putting the hog producers into a straight jacket by not giving an opportunity for a plebiscite. This Hon. Member from Rosthern thinks that Divine Providence has given him and his party the supreme privilege to make decisions respecting the working conditions of working people, the sick, the hungry, regardless of the changing economics, without recourse to better their lot. And particularly under Bill 2. This, Mr. Speaker, the Hon. Member demonstrated to our working people by the implementation of Bill 2 by his Liberal Government. No vote. To the Hon. Member for Rosthern this was not repulsive. This was not putting the working people into a straight jacket. This, Sir, was the rule of law, the law of the mighty Liberals. The Liberal law of suppression of preventing the common ordinary working people to bargain for the sale of the only commodity they had, their hands, Mr. Speaker.

Mr. Speaker, were I, by some supposed miracle of coincidence to find myself sitting among the privileged elite on your left I would hang my head in shame when suppression and freedom are mentioned. The Hon. Member from Rosthern, Mr. Speaker, is obsessed with socialism, in hating it. That is, in his view everyone who has contributed or wants to contribute to the improvement of the economic position of the farming community is an outcast and has no right to rectify or to try to rectify the injustice. To the Hon. Member from Rosthern, Mr. Boden, president of the Saskatchewan Federation of Agriculture, Mr. Turner, the president of the Saskatchewan Wheat Pool, and I suppose the new Minister of Agriculture, the Hon. Eugene Whelan, are all socialists because they are trying to help the farmers and put them into a better economic position.

The Hon. Member from Touchwood (Mr. Meakes), speaking in favor of this Bill, demonstrated that the fluctuations in the price of wheat under the Winnipeg Grain Exchange worked against

the average producers. I can recall the price of wheat fluctuating or changing twice in a day. A farmer at mid-day had to make a decision whether it was the morning or the afternoon price that he wished to sell his grain for. Wheat sold early in any new year brought the highest return and this is not the crop year but the new calendar year. This was, Mr. Speaker, when the prices, during and immediately after harvest when the farmers had to sell to meet farming operating expenses, were the lowest. In some instances the price differential between the October and March price was as much as 60 cents per bushel under the Winnipeg Grain Exchange. These were the days when the free enterprise friends of the gentlemen opposite, the Winnipeg Grain Exchange, reigned supreme in the grain business.

To the Hon. Member for Rosthern, he defended the sale of rape on the open market, all that he has to do is go over the price of rape over the last full crop year and the present to note the varying price changes for that same commodity.

May I, Mr. Speaker, give some examples of the rape prices to the Members of this House. In the 1971-72 crop year, on August 30 of the crop year one year ago which ended July 31 of this year, the rape price was \$2.24½ per bushel. Not \$4 per bushel that my hon. friend from Rosthern gave. In December, three or four months later, the price of rape was \$2.16½. In April it was \$2.32 and in July, the end of the crop year, rape sold for \$2.16 per bushel. Then let's take the 1972-73 crop year. In August, the first month of the new crop year, the morning price, again we have two prices per day – in my village of Krydor, the morning price for rape on that date was \$2.17, the afternoon price was \$2.20 per bushel. Let's go on to December. The price of rape per bushel was \$2.80, February \$3.86, nearing that \$4 mark that my hon. friend from Rosthern quoted in his speech the other day. On March 16, the day on which the Hon. Member for Rosthern spoke, rape was \$3.42¼ at the Wheat Pool elevator in Krydor. Even if a farmer lives in a designated area he may have received 30 cents more per bushel, depending on where you are. But that's not in your area, my hon. friend from Rosthern.

Why should the prices vary in this manner? A bushel of rape is a bushel of rape whether it is in August, November, December or in March. Because the sale and the purchase of rape is presently on the open market the philosophy of my hon. friend applies, boom or bust. He believes that if he is able to hold a bushel of rape until December and is not obligated to sell it in October or September when it is harvested he is to receive \$1.35 more per bushel than the farmer who is compelled to sell rape in October at a lower price.

Mr. Wiebe: — What about the Bill, Dick?

Hon. Mr. Michayluk: — I am talking about the Bill. There is no reason why there should be that differential.

The Hon. Member from Rosthern and most of the Members that have spoken suggested and he was quite firm that the farmers should be given the right to make the decision. As a matter of fact, the Member from Rosthern, Mr. Speaker, stated that when the Wheat Board came into being it was brought in on a plebiscite by the producers of wheat. Were the producers of barley, oats and rye given that same privilege? No! It was brought

under the Wheat Board without any plebiscite. I would hope to see the day, Mr. Speaker, when rape and flax will be brought under the Wheat Board in the same manner as oats, rye and barley.

Some Hon. Members: — Hear, hear!

Hon. Mr. Michayluk: — Mr. Speaker, with specific reference to the establishment of the Hog Marketing Commission for the protecting and stabilizing of the sale of hogs and their prices, this has long been overdue. The Minister of Agriculture, acting on a request from the Hog Producers' Association, the Saskatchewan Swine Breeders, the Saskatchewan Federation of Agriculture, the Saskatchewan Wheat Pool and the National Farmers' Union indicates the desirability and the concurrence by the members of those organizations for the creation of such a commission whether the Liberals want it or not. These are farm organizations, requests came from these organizations. I must compliment the Minister on taking action on their behalf. Farmers, Mr. Speaker, and particularly the producers of hogs, have suffered from the vagaries of fluctuating prices ranging from 16 to 44 cents a pound. Hog prices fluctuated with the law of supply and demand. I am convinced, Mr. Speaker, that the Hog Marketing Commission for Saskatchewan hog producers should stabilize and give permanency to the marketing and the price of this vital industry.

Not only will the establishment of a Hog Marketing Commission in Saskatchewan create stability here but also in our neighboring provinces of Alberta, Manitoba and Ontario where marketing agencies have been in operation for some time. Mr. Speaker, until recently Saskatchewan hogs were being used to force down prices in the three provinces that I have just mentioned. Where marketing agencies have been in existence, it is rather evident, Mr. Speaker, that low prices elsewhere tend to lead to lower prices in Saskatchewan or in our neighboring provinces.

Mr. Speaker, I want to reiterate that the setting up in the province of the Hog Marketing Commission is timely and necessary. It is evident from the Members opposite that they are opposed to the manner in which the commission is set up. There are, Mr. Speaker, and there will be considered efforts to malign and attack the Minister of Agriculture and the commission for the bold step forward to provide to the genuine hog producers an orderly and stable system of marketing their product. The days of the 16 and 44 cent per pound fluctuation in the hog prices could only be resolved by an organization of this type and that is the Hog Marketing Commission. This would give security and stability to the hog producers.

Mr. Speaker, the Hon. Members opposite are opposed to the setting up of a commission without a plebiscite. This to me, Mr. Speaker, is yet another puny effort to drag out the red herring of compulsion which they use in every instance and which, for one reason and only one, is politically motivated. Mr. Speaker, with your permission and the permission of the House I want to read into the records of this Assembly from a letter appearing in the Saskatoon Star-Phoenix by a young concerned hog producer who lives in my constituency. It appeared in the Star-Phoenix, I can table that letter if you so wish. I haven't got the copy from the paper. It appeared under the title "The Key to Stable Hog Marketing". I quote:

At the Saskatchewan Hog Producers' Association annual meeting I spoke in favor of the recently announced Hog Marketing Commission. Obviously my remarks met with violent disapproval. One producer shouted, "How much is Messer paying you?" And another, "I bet you don't know what a pig looks like." I have devoted a great deal of time and money in the past ten years to establish and to try to maintain a viable hog unit. During this period I faced fluctuations that varied from 16½ to 44 cents per pound. This price variation is enough to discourage any young person from venturing into this kind of industry. In 1970-71 the price average was 20 cents per pound. It is interesting to note the consumer price was not that greatly affected. Bacon, for example, was still \$1.10 per pound. That may explain the presence of the people from the meat packing industry and also the commission buyers and truckers at that meeting. Undoubtedly, these people are concerned about the possible loss of profit to themselves.

This is a hog producer speaking.

My only wish is the Saskatchewan Hog Producers' Association would show the same concern for the profits of individual producers. In ten years I followed with interest the achievements of the association. I am quite convinced that their chief purpose is to halt any policy that could strengthen the position of the individual producer. I would summarize their achievements for the producer by saying, "They could be placed neatly into the corner of a pig's eye." The Hog Marketing Commission made possible through the Federal Government's Natural Products Marketing Bill could be a welcomed vehicle to promote and export our product throughout the world. If the Hog Marketing Commission is extended to include the Western Provinces as was suggested, it could open new export markets which our province cannot solely maintain. This export market I feel is the key to a stable hog industry in the province.

Mr. Speaker, the opinions expressed in this letter are in the minds of all genuine hog producers in this province. It is for this reason that I will heartily endorse and support this Bill.

Some Hon. Members: — Hear, hear!

Mr. Hanson (Qu'Appelle-Wolseley): — Mr. Speaker, I commend the Minister of Agriculture for introducing to this House the amendments to The Natural Products Marketing Act, amendments that I feel further strengthen this Act, an Act which we, the younger farmers of this province, really do need and really do appreciate. I think every young farmer in this province who has his head screwed on the right way is really thinking about this type of action. We need this type of action and we support it completely in principle. If we are to rebuild agriculture and rural life in this province we must have complete orderly marketing in this province and we must have firm commitments by both the producer and the purchaser of all supply, demand and quality of the products produced in this province.

If you will permit me. Mr. Speaker, I, too, would like to wander a bit to expound on some of the problems that we, the younger farmers, and some of the older farmers are facing in this province. Flax was selling for \$3.09 a bushel when I first sold mine this fall. The young farmer or the not so well off farmer cannot hold until February or March. He has certain commitments to make in his community if he is going to walk down main street with his head held up. Thus the poorer farmer is forced to sell flax at \$3 a bushel while his neighbor who is well established and has a large collateral base can hold out. It is really shameful to me to see some of these people holding out to get \$5 a bushel while they owe people in the small towns amounts of money for fuel, machinery and whatever.

When we look at hogs, Mr. Speaker, the same thing holds true. True you cannot hold your hogs once they have reached 190 to 195 pounds. What you can do is go out of production for six months or a year if the prices aren't attractive to you. The young farmer or the poor farmer who is not well enough established with a collateral base cannot afford to do this.

Mr. Wiebe: — Neither can the big farmer.

Mr. Hanson: — Even beef needs a serious look in the future, Mr. Speaker. How are we going to achieve firm commitments? The only way, in my mind, Mr. Speaker, is through licensing or permits. The amendments to this Act and what they facilitate will permit the different commodity boards or agencies to issue cards or licences or whatever you want to call them, similar to the Wheat Board registration plates that are now used. Why then, Mr. Speaker, are certain groups opposing the issuing of these cards or licences? This registration will be at no charge in most cases, it will simply give the boards or commissions the records of production and supply and quality that we so badly need if we are to capture the export markets that we deserve.

Mr. Speaker, meetings have been organized across this province lately, not by hog producers, but it would appear to me that they are being organized by a certain grain commodity group if the personnel who are organizing them and chairing these meetings are any indication. At these meetings, Mr. Speaker, there has been complete misrepresentation of The Natural Products Marketing Act. It is completely misleading to the farmers, the information that has been given out at these meetings. When certain people are there that have the ability to correct the misrepresentation they are not even afforded the opportunity to use a mike. I don't think that we can put up with this type of action by disinterested groups or what should be disinterested groups in my opinion. The thing that they are forgetting is that nowhere in this Act does it give the commission the power to control production. And this is one of the keys to the difference between a commission and a marketing board.

If the people who are so violently opposed to the Hog Marketing Commission would take the time to read the complete Act they would find that part 3, section 22 and 23 of the Act itself are the real guts to the Hog Marketing Commission. And maybe then they could discuss the thing on an intelligent basis.

March 15, 1973

Every young farmer in this province, Mr. Speaker, must demand, first of all, that all grains be under the Wheat Board or a similar grains board. In my opinion we can not permit the fluctuations in price and the gambling to continue whether it be with flax, rye, rapeseed or wheat on the future wheat market.

I think for a second point we must establish a national feed grains policy with a feed bank situation and only through guaranteeing feed stocks can you guarantee a reasonable amount of livestock production. We can also guarantee a basic market for feed grains by having a feed bank and feed grains policy.

The United States has found that this is the only real answer to stabilizing production and prices. This Act is the first step in full realization of these goals, Mr. Speaker. The stakes are too high to continue the gamble that we have permitted in the past.

The new generation of farmers want a reward for their capabilities and good management. Marketing commissions and boards can certainly assist them in receiving their fair, and I stress the word fair, return, Mr. Speaker.

You know it is amazing that the people of the province agree that sharing costs is about the best method to finance health programs, education, municipal and nearly every service to our population. But why then are the Palliser group and the Rapeseed Association, to name only a couple, so opposed to pooling and negotiating revenues from our production? It could be, Mr. Speaker, that the Grain Exchange has a hand upon the steering wheel in most of these organizations and is also chipping in for the gas.

I think that this truly represents the real goings-on in some of these organizations. We, the young farmers, are tired of selling our flax or our rape early in the year at ridiculously low prices to pay off our creditors while the well established farmers with good collateral can hold for better markets usually receiving double the return for their crops than what the unestablished person does.

This is an insane system, Mr. Speaker, on which to build a stable agricultural Saskatchewan. Action is needed now and amendments to this Bill are the first step.

Compared to the Canadian Wheat Board Act, this Natural Products Marketing Act contains relatively few controls, yet only the Hon. Dave Boldt has guts enough to show his true colors in opposing this Bill. His colors, Mr. Speaker, I think truly represent the attitude of both the Liberal and Conservative Parties and this attitude our people of Saskatchewan cannot allow to continue.

Mr. Speaker, compulsion they say is the reason that they oppose The Natural Products Marketing Act. Yet I just returned from the SARM convention where they passed resolutions calling for compulsion in establishing a warble free province and other resolutions dealing with compulsion.

Mr. Speaker, due to the fact that I was at the SARM convention I did not fully prepare a speech and in closing I will support the motion wholeheartedly.

Some Hon. Members: — Hear, hear!

Mr. Lane (Lumsden): — Mr. Speaker, it is still very obvious that the Members opposite don't know the difference between trying to improve farming and trying to control farming.

It is the position of the Liberal Party that if the farmers want to give up absolute control over their farming operations to the Government or to any delegated authority that they should have the right to vote before they give up that right. It is that right that is taken away by the Members opposite, Mr. Speaker.

We note the deliberate attempts to mislead this House by the Hon. Member for Redberry (Mr. Michayluk) when he refuses to give us the name of the person that wrote that letter. It certainly sounds like a very good NDP supporter, Mr. Speaker, because he is afraid to give the name. Could it be Mr. Ted Turner who wrote that letter? Could it be the Member himself who wrote that letter? We can think of all sorts of possibilities because the Member from Redberry was just too afraid to give the name to the Members of this House.

Mr. Speaker, the Government opposite is afraid to give the farmers a vote on this Bill. Why do they fear the people? That is the question that is going throughout this province right now. The Hon. Member from Qu'Appelle-Wolseley (Mr. Hanson) who just sat down says that any young farmer who has his head screwed on the right way needs all the help he can get. I say, Mr. Speaker, any young farmer who loses his tractor in a dugout needs all the help that he can get and that is precisely the help that he is asking for.

Our policy and our position is very simple and the position of the farming community is very simple. If the farmers are going to give up the control of their farming operations to the Government or to any marketing board they should have the right to vote on whether they wish to give us those rights. And they should have that right in spite of the way the Members opposite are afraid to have discussion at the meetings. The Minister of Agriculture (Mr. Messer) goes around to his carefully operated and controlled meetings and what happens? People are not allowed to speak. And yet when someone else has a meeting opposing the Bill they are evil people, they don't represent the farmers and they don't have the right to speak.

Mr. Speaker, I will have much more to say on this particular piece of legislation as will the farmers and the people of Saskatchewan, and I beg leave to adjourn the debate.

Debate adjourned.

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