

**LEGISLATIVE ASSEMBLY OF SASKATCHEWAN**  
**Third Session — Seventeenth Legislature**  
**41st Day**

**Thursday, March 22, 1973.**

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

**WELCOME TO STUDENTS**

**Hon. E. L. Tchorzewski:** — (Humboldt) Mr. Speaker, I should like to take this opportunity through you to introduce to this House and to welcome a group of 26 Grade Seven and Eight students from Fulda, Saskatchewan, which is located in my constituency. The students are accompanied by 16 adults, several parents, and Mr. Glen Hepp who is their teacher. They left early this morning at 7:30 and have visited the RCMP Museum in the city of Regina as well as the Museum of Natural History. And they have had a tour of this building. I shall be meeting with them at about 3:00 o'clock when they leave this Chamber.

Mr. Speaker, I think it is of some significance that these students come from Fulda, because recently Saskatchewan was very ably represented by the Provincial High School Boys' Curling Champions who curled out of the Humboldt Collegiate but actually come from the community of Fulda. I think at this time I should like to congratulate the community of Fulda for producing such fine curlers for the Province of Saskatchewan who so ably represented this province in the School Boys' Curling Championship.

**Hon. Members:** — Hear, hear!

**Mr. Tchorzewski:** — Mr. Speaker, I know that all the Members of the House will join with me in hoping that the group here today seated in the west gallery, from Fulda has had a very interesting visit with us in the Legislative Assembly, interesting and educational and that they will benefit from it in future years.

**Hon. Members:** — Hear, hear!

**Mr. D. M. McPherson:** — (Regina Lakeview) Mr. Speaker, I should like to introduce to you and to the Members of this House 48 Grade Eight students from Davin Public School here in Regina. The 48 students have been in the House since 1:00 o'clock. They had lunch here. They have been on a tour. And you spoke to them, Mr. Speaker, which I very much appreciate. I hope they enjoy their stay here with us in the House. And I want to congratulate Mr. Reock and Mr. Graham for bringing the class here. I know all Members will join with me in welcoming them to the House.

**Hon. Members:** — Hear, hear!

**Mr. E. L. Cowley:** — (Biggar) Mr. Speaker, I take great pleasure once again today, following yesterday in introducing another group of students from Delisle. There are 43 Grade Eight students. I haven't had the opportunity to meet them yet but will be meeting with them shortly to have a short chat before they head for home.

They are accompanied by their teachers Mr. Novicky and Mr. Jameson. Mr. Michayluk, Member for Redberry just informed me that he knows Mr. Novicky, so perhaps he will be able to drop down and say hello with me at the same time. I should like to, through you, Mr. Speaker, welcome them to this Chamber and hope that the afternoon's proceedings are both informative and enjoyable for these students.

**Hon. Members:** — Hear, hear!

**Mr. Speaker:** — (Wadena) I believe there is also a group here from the Miller Composite High, Grade XII students from the constituency of Mr. Baker. Mr. Baker isn't in the House and the other Members weren't aware of it. So I should like to welcome them at this time also.

**Hon. Members:** — Hear, hear!

## QUESTIONS

### Use of Dieldrin for Grasshoppers

**Mr. C. P. MacDonald:** — (Milestone) Mr. Speaker, before the Orders of the Day, I should like to direct a question to the Minister of Agriculture. I have received a copy of a letter from the Plant Products Division of the Federal Government to the Agricultural Extension Board in Moose Jaw regarding the use of dieldrin for grasshopper control. I would like to quote a brief paragraph:

There may be situations where dieldrin can be used under strictly controlled conditions remote from crop lands which may help in the control of a severe outbreak. Departmental officials will be pleased to explore these possibilities with provincial officers at any time.

I have been in continuous contact with the Federal Government regarding this matter. Now they seem very willing to explore possibilities with the Provincial Department of Agriculture to use dieldrin if there is a very severe outbreak of grasshoppers in southwestern or any part of Saskatchewan. Would the Minister of Agriculture be willing to make immediate arrangements with the Federal officials and the Federal Government to set up the control situation where dieldrin can be used?

**Hon. J. R. Messer:** — (Minister of Agriculture) Mr. Speaker, I just happen to have made immediate arrangements for that yesterday when I was in Ottawa talking to Mr. Whelan, Minister of Agriculture and Mr. Lang, Minister in charge of the Canadian Wheat Board.

**Some Hon. Members:** — Hear, hear!

**Mr. Messer:** — This is another indication of the action that farmers in Saskatchewan get from this New Democratic Government.

**Some Hon. Members:** — Hear, hear!

**Mr. Messer:** — They have not given us blanket coverage to use dieldrin but we will be submitting a plan to them for their approval. They will be considering this proposal, as I think the Members opposite know and farmers of Saskatchewan, that it is the Federal Agency that licenses the chemical. We shall give them a plan in which provincial personnel will be involved in supervising the application of dieldrin. It is then up to them to make a decision in regard to whether they will allow us authority to do so or not.

## ANNOUNCEMENTS

### Simpson Flyers Win Intermediate D Hockey Championship

**Mr. D. Faris:** — (Arm River) Mr. Speaker, before the Orders of the Day, I should like to draw the attention of the House to the fact that the Simpson Flyers have once again won the Intermediate “D” Hockey Championship. In order to achieve this they had to defeat (for the northern championship) the team from Muenster, whom I shall call the ‘Muenster Monsters’. Having overcome that team they went on to defeat the Fillmore Foxes by a score of 12 to 2 in total point series. Mr. Speaker, this is the fifth consecutive year that the Simpson Flyers have won the championship and the sixth time out of seven years. I would save the time of this House next year by announcing at this time they are going to win the championship again next year. But they did miss once out of seven.

**Hon. Members:** — Hear, hear!

## 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.

**Mr. K. R. MacLeod:** — (Albert Park) Mr. Speaker, it would be in order I believe to trace a brief history of this legislation before coming to the iniquitous material before us and the iniquitous results which apparently are to flow from them.

This Bill originated as The Natural Products Marketing Act of 1945, which constituted a Saskatchewan Marketing Board for the purpose of overseeing the establishment of marketing boards for natural products in Saskatchewan. The general regulations were passed on July 21, 1950, some 5 years after the passage of the Act. And they provided, among other things, the procedure for the establishment of various boards to deal with individual products.

The interesting and important thing about that, Mr. Speaker, is that the initiative was to come from the producers. The regulations provided for the establishment of a plan by a group of persons engaged in the production or marketing of a natural product, and provided that the producer marketing board would be to administer the plan, and provided for the election of people who would administer the plan.

Each plan would be submitted to the Saskatchewan Marketing Board to outline the purposes of the plan and the method of operation including the election of people to the board.

I wish to draw your attention, Mr. Speaker, to the fact that in every case the initiative rested with the producer. The plan was then studied by the Saskatchewan Marketing Board and the Board was empowered to conduct elections. The very first plan established under The Natural Products Marketing Act, 1945, was the Honey Plan which was established in 1950 by Gazette of September 23 that year.

There are two important matters there, Mr. Speaker. The first one is that they established a reasonable set of objectives. They exempted small producers. And they provided that the members of the Honey Board should be beekeepers registered in the Province of Saskatchewan. That is the kind of plan which was envisaged at the time that The Natural Products Marketing Act, 1945 was established. It was the kind of plan introduced in September 1950 for the honey producers.

Mr. Speaker, the plans established under the Liberals deserve some examination — both for the kind of plan and the way in which they were established.

The first one was the plan established for the chicken producers — the chicken broiler producers. I would like to read, Mr. Speaker, briefly from the regulation of April 1, 1966, which provided that there would be a vote taken by the producers. This said as follows:

The Minister stated that the proposed plan to control and regulate the marketing of broiler chickens that are within the Province of Saskatchewan should be submitted to a vote of producers as defined in the plan and further, that the plan only be established if the percentage of those voting in favor of the establishment be not less than 65 per cent of all those voting.

Mr. Speaker, the very first plan established under the Liberal Government provided not only that it be by the producers but that there be a two-thirds majority vote.

That vote was held, Mr. Speaker, and the regulations of April 1, 1966, establish the following and I quote:

A summary of the votes showed that 35 producers voted in favor and that two voted against. Stating these results on the basis of a ratio, it shows that 95 per cent of those voting were in favor of the plan. If the percentage were stated on the basis of estimated eligible voters, it shows that 83 per cent favored the plan

In view of that 83 per cent majority, Mr. Speaker, the Board, the Saskatchewan Marketing Board recommended that the plan be instituted and it was instituted.

One or two features of the plan were as follows. First of all, again, small producers were exempt. The little guy was not required to participate. He was not required to go through the rigmarole and the difficulty that may be involved in the plan,

particularly having regard to his stake in production.

Mr. Speaker, clauses 7, 8, 10 and 11 establish clearly that the board was to be an elected board. It was to consist of five members, three of which were to be a quorum and that only persons who were qualified and registered as broiler chicken growers were entitled to vote. And only person who were qualified as broiler chicken producers were entitled to sit as members of the board.

The qualification for casting a ballot in any election for the board and the qualification for standing as a board member, and for serving as a board member, was qualification as a true producer as defined in the plan.

Mr. Speaker, that wasn't the only plan established during the Liberal years. I refer to the Gazette of June 2, 1967. I want to read again the opening remarks:

The Minister further stated that pursuant to The Natural Products Marketing Act, the Lieutenant Governor-in-Council had ordered that the proposed plan to control and regulate the marketing of turkeys that are within the Province of Saskatchewan be submitted to a vote of producers as defined in the plan. And further, that the plan only be established if the percentage of those voting in favor of the establishment, be not less than 65 per cent of all those voting.

The vote was held, Mr. Speaker, and the result which I quote from June 1967 Gazette is as follows:

The Minister further states that the said plan to control and regulate the marketing of turkeys was submitted to a vote of producers as defined in the plan. And the percentage of voters in favor of the establishment of the plan was 88 per cent of all those voting. (The Minister further states) that the Saskatchewan Marketing Board has reviewed the results of the vote and has recommended to His Honour that the plan be instituted.

And it was instituted as of August 1, 1967. A brief look at the regulations setting forth the plan show that it is similar to the previous plan.

To begin with producers who marketed less than 400 turkeys in any one year were exempt. Here again the little guy was not required to take out a license or register as a producer with the Turkey Producers Marketing Board.

Clauses 8, 10, 11 and 12 set forth the membership and the qualification for membership and election of the Turkey Board.

To begin with the members were to be elected only by persons who were registered as producers. And a person could stand for office only if he was in fact a registered producer. It provided the quorum and it provided that the Board should consist of five members, five producers registered with the Turnkey Board.

Here again, Mr. Speaker, we have a case where there was a plebiscite. Not only was a majority required, the majority must

be not less than 65 per cent in favor. In each of those cases well over 65 per cent were favorable to the plan.

Another board established during the Liberal years was the Egg board. On August 29, 1969, the following appeared and I quote:

In accordance with the provisions of Section 10 of the regulations under The Natural Products Marketing Act, the Saskatchewan Marketing Board has conducted a plebiscite on the question of the establishment of the proposed Saskatchewan Commercial Egg Producers Marketing Plan. It provided that not less than 65 per cent of the persons casting a ballot must be in favor of the plan. A summary of the vote showed that 193 producers voted in favor, 54 voted against. Stating these results on the basis of a ratio it showed that 78 per cent of those voting were in favor of the plan. In view of the decisions of the producers as revealed by the analysis of the vote the Saskatchewan Marketing Board recommended that the Plan be instituted.

The Plan was instituted by the regulations of August 29, 1969. And here again the exemptions provided that egg producers who market commercial eggs from less than 300 layers will be exempted from the plan. Here again the little guy was not required to take out a license or be registered as a producer.

Here again, clauses 10, 11 and 12 provided that the board should consist only of producers registered with the plan, secondly, that elections be conducted only by members registered with the board as producers. It provided further . . .

**Mr. Rolfes:** — Area bargaining!

**Mr. MacLeod:** — . . . for area bargaining as somebody suggested.

It provided that two members would be elected from each of three areas of the province, and it carried on to designate which parts of the province were included in each of the areas.

It provided by clause 12 that the egg board would make all arrangements for conducting the elections of the members. I wish to emphasize again, Mr. Speaker, that that plan was only established after an election in which not less than 65 per cent of those voted were in favor of the establishment of the board. In fact in every case, Mr. Speaker, the number of persons who supported the board with a democratic vote were well in excess of 65 per cent.

I want to summarize these results, Mr. Speaker, as follows: With respect to every board established during the Liberal years not one marketing board was established by the Liberals without a vote.

**Some Hon. Members:** — Hear, hear!

**Mr. MacLeod:** — In not one case was a board established without the concurrence of a majority in excess of 65 per cent of those entitled to vote.

Mr. Bowerman: — It isn't right.

**Mr. MacLeod:** — Somebody suggested it isn't right. I suggest that perhaps he read the regulations.

Now in every case a board was established in an orderly and reasonable manner. In every case a board was established democratically. In every case the board was producer controlled. In every case the board was established by a vote of producers and only producers were entitled to sit on the board. In every case, of course, the little guy was exempt.

Now, I want to compare that with the kind of thing we are about to have now. We are now about to have a commission, and the Commission is going to do to a large extent the same things as the boards previously established but with some dramatically different situations, very dramatically different conditions. First of all, there is to be no vote. Secondly, there is no assurance whatsoever of producer control. There is absolutely no democracy. I want to suggest, Mr. Speaker, that this bill, Bill No. 50, when read in conjunction with the Act which it seeks to amend has and shows a severe erosion of the rights of people in Saskatchewan and it particularly shows the erosion of the rights of producers of farm products in Saskatchewan. This is a severe encroachment by the Government into the affairs and lives of our people. But more than that, Mr. Speaker, it demonstrates the possibility and the likelihood that the Government will become a handler of the people's money whether the people like it or not and may well be a competitor of the people it seeks to control.

Now I refer the Members particularly to the ones who have spoken before the time that I was speaking, to Bill No. 50 and I refer to clause 4. Clause 4 seeks to amend Section 23 by adding the following clauses;

(n) giving the Commission power to market as principal or agent any regulated product.

What the Government wants is the power to sell on its own account, to become the owner of and to handle these products. It may well then become the competitor of the people whom it seeks to control and regulate.

It proposes by subsection (p) in Section 23 the requirement that, and it has the power —

(p) to require any person who owes money to a producer in respect of the sale of any regulated product by the producer to pay the money to the Commission.

Perhaps the Hon. Minister would tell us why he should have the power and be able to demand that money which should go to a producer must be paid to the Commission? The producer would be very pleased I think to collect his own money and receive his own money without the meddling of the Commission.

So we are replacing boards with commissions, we are replacing democracy, the democratically established boards with a non-democratically established commission. The Government proposes to establish a commission, it proposes to eliminate the necessity of democratically elected boards; it proposes to eliminate the initiative coming from the producer with the initiative now coming from the Government; it proposes to have the power to act

as a principal and not just as an agent to the producer; it proposes to be a principal and not just a regulator; it proposes to handle the money of the producer; it proposes, in short, Mr. Speaker, the kind of regulation and the kind of government interference with the producer which we object to.

Mr. Speaker, if the Government acted in its true role as a government, as a helper, as a benefactor of the producer, if it attempted to provide orderly marketing for the producer with the minimum of regulation, if it attempted to assist the producer, we would have no objection. Mr. Speaker, we were sadly misled last year by the remarks of the Minister of Agriculture when he introduced The Natural Products Marketing Act, 1972. We were sadly misled into believing that he was establishing a certain housekeeping bill which would tidy up the situation. We believed that he wanted to update the situation so that he could act more beneficially for the benefit of producers. Little did we realize, Mr. Speaker, that it was the intention of the Government to eliminate democratically elected boards and replace it by commissions. Little did we realize it was the intention of the Government to buy a large share of Intercontinental Packers. Little did we realize that it was the intention of the Government, without the advice or the consent of the producer, to get into every facet of production.

Mr. Speaker, having regard to the history of this, having regard to the severe turn that this present Act has taken under this present Government, we have no choice but to oppose Bill No. 50.

**Some Hon. Members:** — Hear, hear!

**Mr. P. P. Mostoway:** — (Hanley) Mr. Speaker, I wish to spend a few minutes on this Bill in defense of it. I defend it because I think it will tend to promote orderly marketing, something that our friends opposite have always been opposed to. I defend it along with the Wheat Board, the Dairy Commission and other bodies that promote better returns to our farmers. Contrary to Liberals who, by opposing this Bill, are really saying once again, let dog eat dog, while their 'corporate kin' rush down to the banks to make their deposits.

**Some Hon. Members:** — Hear, hear!

**Mr. Mostoway:** — Mr. Speaker, this is evidence of moral, ethical and political decay. I ask Liberals opposite to vote for this Bill to prove that they have not reached the levels that I have just mentioned. I ask them to vote for this Bill which will benefit farmers and in turn benefit the people of this province.

Mr. Speaker, one Member opposite claims a plebiscite should have been held. Oh, they are the plebiscite boys, all right. I well remember just prior to when their Party was elected to power in 1964. I believe that they promised a plebiscite on drug care. Did they have one? I should say not. Mr. Speaker, I maintain that to promise and then not to keep that promise is part and parcel of the Liberal Party's heritage. Far better to have a government of boldness, of new visions, of new methods than to have one of immobility as personified by the Leader of the Opposition (Mr. Steuart) and I stress this word, only some



of his crew.

**An Hon. Member:** — The are divided on this one!

**Mr. Mostoway:** — Mr. Speaker, I see that an ad has appeared in the Western Producer urging hog producers to send in little clippings to various Members of this House. I don't wish to belittle anyone because I believe those who made up the ad had honorable intentions but there are some errors. The first error is in the statement that this is the first commodity to be put under a compulsory system without a vote. Mr. Speaker, this is not correct. I believe wheat, oats, barley and rye were put into the realm of compulsion without a vote by the producers of those commodities. Compulsory quota control exists for flax and rapeseed too. Secondly, it is not correct to say that the Hog Marketing Commission is not responsible to hog producers. Mr. Speaker, it is responsible to hog producers by virtue of the fact that this Government is responsible to all people, including hog producers.

**Some Hon. Members:** — Hear, hear!

**Mr. Mostoway:** — Now far be it from me to presume that a certain gentleman connected with the Saskatchewan Hog Producers Association is a dedicated Liberal. Far be it from me to presume that the Hon. Leader of the Opposition had a hand in this ad. But, Mr. Speaker, at times I do a little bit of wondering, and sometimes I wonder why a statement is in that ad in regard to this Government buying shares in Intercontinental Packers. Is it in there to arouse suspicion and to cause division? Or is the man or the men behind this ad against ensuring that another company does not have a monopoly in livestock processing? Are they against more of our livestock being processed in Saskatchewan? Are they against stabilization for the benefit of our hog producers?

Mr. Speaker, Members opposite really can't be serious when they babble about a plebiscite. Did they offer the trustees a plebiscite before they rammed certain things down their throats? Did they offer a plebiscite to the farmers before they stood idly by when farmers received 17 cents a pound for hogs? Did they offer a plebiscite before they put on a penalty for being sick?

**An Hon. Member:** — Did they have a plebiscite on LIFT?

**Mr. Mostoway:** — Yes, what about LIFT? Did they offer a plebiscite before they initiated their pupil-teacher ratio? Did they offer a plebiscite before they taxed families who might want to give mothers a break by eating out? Mr. Speaker, I could go on and on, but I am afraid it would be too horrible, the facts that is, for Hon. Members if I did so.

Now getting back to that ad and the Hog Producers; Association, may I ask why that organization saw fit to be a member of the Saskatchewan Federation of Agriculture all this time, then all of a sudden pull out? Mr. Speaker, I put this move on a par with an Arabian marriage, where divorce is almost had with a snap of the fingers. Only in this case, I

think the snap was snapped right here in Regina. For this purpose, for conveniences sake, I am going to label it as a 'Steuart Snap'.

Mr. Speaker, one of the Members opposite talked about vertical integration and he is right, it can be insidious as practiced by such conglomerates as Ford, Alcan and GM. He is perfectly right.

Another Member opposite says it is this Government's intention to tell farmers when they will be allowed to work and sell their products. I think we are all aware that this is just pure gibberish. But I should like to point out that your Liberal Government in Ottawa is completely different from what you would paint this Government as being. I think we all remember your glorious LIFT program. Remember the one where your Trudeau Government never told farmers a single thing, until it was too late. Then the hare-brained LIFT lunacy was practically forced on them which in turn caused poverty and hardship on our farmers.

Mr. Speaker, another Member opposite claimed we have no faith in farmers. He claimed we show this by establishing a commission rather than a board. Now I should just like to say that we do have faith in our farmers and that it is the Liberals who do not. Now I think proof of this can be seen by the improper wording they use in advertising their meetings. I think the fact that they are holding meetings and urging hog producers to listen to their propaganda is ample proof to show that they never had faith in farmers, nor do they now. I say this because if they did have faith in them, they would not incite people as they are now trying to do. So I say to Members opposite, stop using our hard working farmers as pawns in your cheap game of political chess.

**Some Hon. Members:** — Hear, hear!

**Mr. Mostoway:** — Gentlemen, put an end to your desire to divide and once more oppress with your ivory tower ideas and discourteous remarks to our people, as you did during those long, cold, and oppressive seven years.

**Some Hon. Members:** — Hear, hear!

**Mr. Mostoway:** — Mr. Speaker, I noted the other day an article in one of our daily papers which stated that many misunderstandings had been cleared up wherever the chairman of the Hog Marketing Commission held public meetings. I also noticed from the article that hog producers are accepting the commission as being able to help them. This is good. Well, it is just too bad that these meetings could not have been held earlier because if they had, I am afraid a lot of Liberal speakers would have been speaking to empty halls — and this is as it should be.

**Some Hon. Members:** — Hear, hear!

**Mr. Mostoway:** — Mr. Speaker, by now you are no doubt aware that I will be supporting this Bill which will enable Saskatchewan farmers to realize the maximum benefits on their labor through orderly

marketing and the highest prices possible.

**Some Hon. Members:** — Hear, hear!

**Mr. D. G. Stuart:** — (Leader of the Opposition) I'll just wait until the noise over there has subsided, then I'll get on with the Bill.

Mr. Speaker, I don't suppose anything could epitomize what is wrong with this Bill more than the nonsense and the drivel that we just heard uttered by the Member who spoke on the Bill from the NDP side.

**Some Hon. Members:** — Hear, hear!

**Mr. Stuart:** — This is exactly what is wrong with this Bill, this is exactly what is wrong with this Act, Mr. Speaker. Here is a school teacher standing up telling our farmers, I'm in favor of a compulsory Hog Marketing Board. He makes his living teaching school, when he isn't in the Legislative Assembly. What we say, this is what's wrong with this Bill. It is going to turn the control, the absolute control over the marketing, growing, delivering the raising of hogs and next cattle, over to the bureaucrats. People who don't make a living on the farm, people who haven't raised a product by the seat of their brow, people who are impractical, people who are going to sit back here in Regina and in Saskatoon getting \$20,000 and \$25,000 a year, telling the little farmer (out trying to raise the hogs) what to do, how to do it and when to do it.

**Mr. Messer:** — How about Alberta?

**Mr. Stuart:** — Oh, we'll talk about Alberta. Yes, you do it exactly, you Mr. Minister with the swelled head and the big tongue, you do it exactly as they have done it in Alberta and you'll find that we will support you and so will the farmers. Just do it exactly the same. Give the farmers a board, give them a vote and then let them control the production and the sale of their own product. Do it that way and you won't have any problem. But you won't do it . . .

**Mr. Speaker:** — Order! We'll get along better if only one Member will speak at a time.

**Mr. Stuart:** — Fine, thank you, Mr. Speaker.

**Some Hon. Members:** — Hear, hear!

**Mr. Stuart:** — Mr. Speaker, I agree with you. I don't mind the yiking and the yaking and the heckling because their consciences are bothering them. If they read the paper they know what is happening.

He talks about empty halls. I've just come back from a little tour and I'm going to take another tour. We will be holding a meeting in every rural seat in this province. We had over 300 in Maple Creek. We had over 250 in Shaunavon.

Over 250 in Carrot Rover. I tell you Mr. Minister that those farmers are mad, they are coming out to the meetings.

**Some Hon. Members:** — Hear, hear!

**Mr. Steuart:** — Mr. Speaker, before we look at this Bill, I think we have to look at it in context with the other things that this Government has done in regard to agriculture. This Bill in fact is one more stepping stone, one more building block in the NDP plan to control our basic industry, agriculture. And let's look at how this pattern has developed in 20 short months. First, Mr. Speaker, we had the Land Bank and we still have it. What does the Land Bank do? The Land Bank now means that as of today 20, 22 and certainly by the end of this year 30 million dollars worth of our farm land will be under control and in the hands of the NDP Government of Saskatchewan.

**An Hon. Member:** — More than that.

**Mr. Steuart:** — Somebody said more than that. I wouldn't doubt it. It also means that if by some unbelievable bad piece of luck for the people of this province this Government lasts for five years, better than \$100 million worth of farm land will be owned and controlled by the NDP Government. You read that Act, Mr. Speaker, you listen to the speeches opposite and you know this, you know that they don't intend to sell that land to the farms. They get up and they boast about a new land tenure system. They said we are not going to burden the farmers of Saskatchewan with the need to own their own land. It is not a new tenure system, they have got it behind the iron curtain. There they call it by the real name, socialism. That's building block number one. Through the Land Bank they intend, and they are now doing it to control the farm land of the Province of Saskatchewan.

**Mr. Bowerman:** — Order, order!

**Mr. Steuart:** — If I was shaped like you, Mr. Minister of Shellbrook I might feel I was out of order too. But I am not out of order I am in pretty good shape. Mr. Speaker, that is building block number one.

Building block number two, is that Bill the Minister of Agriculture brought in, now you see it, now you don't called An Act Respecting Foreign Ownership of Agricultural Lands in Saskatchewan. I want to tell the people of this House and the people of this province that while the Government withdrew the Bill because of what we did and what the people of this province did, they haven't changed their minds. That's building block number two.

**Mr. Messer:** — On a Point of Order.

**Mr. Steuart:** — What's your Point of Order?

**Mr. Messer:** — I should like to know what the Hon. Leader of the Opposition is talking about. We are talking about The Natural Products Marketing Act. He was talking about Land Bank and he is now talking about Foreign Ownership of which there is no such Bill before this Legislature. I ask him to keep his remarks to

the subject he should be debating.

**Mr. Steuart:** — Mr. Speaker, on the Point of Order, on the so-called Point of Order, and I don't think he would know a Point of Order if he sat on it. Let me tell you what I am building up. Before we can consider, before the Hon. Members of this House can consider whether we should pass this vicious legislation or not giving the Government more control, in fact control of the products that are raised on our farm, I suggest that they have to look at the whole pattern, the whole development that is taking place since this Government came to office. I say I am making my case first about the control of the land, and I want to make that case. Then of the control of what is grown and produced on the land. When I end up I want to tell the people of this province that if we give these people their way and if they are not stopped now, Mr. Speaker, or not stopped very soon, they will not only control the farm land as they are now in the process of doing, they will control every aspect of agriculture and of farming in this province. So, Mr. Speaker, that is why I talk about the Land Bank, and I say that is building block number one. Foreign Ownership, if you can't buy the land, then you limit the market. You say to people, you can't even die and leave your land to your son or your daughter if they live in Ontario or Alberta. You say to a farmer, you've live here all your life you can't retire to British Columbia or to Ontario, because if you do the Attorney General or the NDP Government would have the right to seize your land and dispose of it as he saw fit. To whom? The Land Bank. Building block number two.

The foreign control of land — you took it out when you held hearings but you will bring it back. Don't try and kid the public that the NDP have any other intention than bringing back an Act that will control who can own land and who cannot own land in the Province of Saskatchewan. You are doing it now.

What's the next building block of this little plan, this little scheme? What is the Estates Tax? Well, a lot of farmers think, well, we will escape the Estates Tax. There is a great big limit of \$200,000. Well, the businessman can escape the Estates Tax and they are doing it. You know, they are going to Alberta, they are going somewhere else. They can pick up their bonds and their stocks and their cash and they can sell out. But there is one group in this province who can't escape the Estates Tax and that is the farmer, the rancher. They can't pick up their land, their quarter section, their section, their two sections and walk out of Saskatchewan. Why did they put it in? Mr. Speaker, they didn't put the Estates Tax in because it gives them any revenue. It doesn't. It doesn't produce \$3 million. Mr. Speaker, \$700 million they spend in total. \$2.5 to \$3 million raised in Estates Tax, it means little or nothing to the income of this province. But it does mean something when you talk about the total control of land, of farm land and of ranch land in this province and that, Mr. Speaker, is building block number three.

You've got the Land Bank, which is just a control and a grab by the Provincial Government to own and control the land. You've got the Foreign Ownership which will be brought back in in some other form and again rammed down the throats of the people of this province if that outfit lasts long enough on that side. You've got the Estates Tax to force people to sell

farms and ranch lands just to pay the tax when they die. When the people die, they have built up their fortune, they have built up a reasonable equity in their farm or their ranch. And so you have this picture, and it's here. It is not emerging, it is here now. The NDP Government in 19 months has assumed a major control on the farm land in the Province of Saskatchewan. Their tentacles, their greedy fingers are into the pockets of every farmer in this province.

Now we come to Bill 50. What's the point of controlling the land if you don't control what is produced on the land? Well, Mr. Speaker, take a look at Bill 50. It is the most vicious piece of legislation, taken in context with the record of the NDP Government, that has ever been presented in this House. What does it do? It gives this Government the right under a Commission, without a vote, without any consultation, without a by-your-leave from the hog producers, the cattle producers, honey producers, sheep ranchers, farmers, it gives them absolute and total control over every product that is grown, developed or produced on our farms. Read the Act, you back-benchers that talk about freedom and human rights, that is the kind of control you have taken to yourselves or you have given to some of those front benchers in this Bill.

Then it says that our farmers for the first time in the history of this province are going to have to be licensed and if they don't get a license they are subject to a \$500 fine or maybe even a term in jail. So, of course, they will get a licence because they don't want to go to jail. Then it gives the Government control, obviously, of who can get a licence. It not only says what kind of hogs and cattle you are going to raise and develop, it says what kind they can develop, it says when they can sell them and it says whom they can sell them to. It even says who can take them to market for them. Oh, Mr. Farmer Brown may have decided for years that he and his neighbor would take their own cattle or hogs to market. Not after this Bill is passed, not after they put this power under a Commission. Mr. Messer, or his high-priced — \$20,000-a-year-plus hog commissioner whom he is advertising for down in Iowa. Incidentally MR. Messer — I don't know if you were aware of that, I am sure you were — but when we get this fellow from Iowa or wherever, he will have, and it says right in the ad, almost total control over the hog industry in this province.

**Mr. Messer:** — That's almost a lie.

**Mr. Steuart:** — Well, read the ad. It's almost a lie — well, let's read it. Were you aware Mr. Messer this ran in the Iowa paper? You were. Were you aware that this ad ran in the Des Moines Register Tribune, March 10th, 1973 for a general manager, for a hog commissioner? Let's read some of the things it says Mr. Minister:

The Saskatchewan Hog Marketing Commission, recently established by the Saskatchewan Government to market that province's hog production, an approximately \$50 million annual industry with considerable greater potential, is seeking a general manager to help create a dynamic marketing organization.

**Some Hon. Members:** — Hear, hear!

**Mr. Steuart:** — Whom will this man be responsible to?

The general manager will be responsible for developing detailed objectives, policies, procedures, programs, budgets and other plans to guide the Commission's operations, reporting to the Board of Commissioners and to that Board alone.

Not to the farmers, not to the Legislative Assembly, but to the Board of Commissioners, chosen by the Government and to that Board alone. Its says that right in here.

His opportunity for involvement and influence will be virtually unlimited.

That's in the ad.

The Commissioner's head office will be in Saskatoon and his salary will be in the \$20,000 range with the usual employee benefits.

They are even prepared to move this fellow who is coming up from Des Moines, Iowa. They are even prepared to pay his moving expenses up here. It tells, "Box 1242, Regina, Saskatchewan", and they had to put on 'Canada' in case some of those yankee-doodles didn't know where it was.

Well, Mr. Speaker, that's what we have now. That's not all that's in that Bill. If all that was in that Bill was that the farmers had to be licensed and the Government could say who could grow hogs, when they could grown them, how they could grow them, where they could sell them, whom they could sell tem to, how they could take them to market, you would think that would be power enough, unlimited power, absolutely dictatorial power.

**Mr. Messer:** — Just like when you were in power.

**Mr. Steuart:** — Now, Mr. Speaker, what else did they put in there? They put in there a clause, reverse onus clause, now that's a dandy. Take a look at it. It's on page 4 under a little subtitle called 'Proof'. In case you haven't read it some of you people on the other side who get and bleed about individual rights, bleed about humanity first and people before dollars. Let me read what this little piece of this Act says. I would remind you you . . .

**An Hon. Member:** — Take it as read.

**Mr. Steuart:** — You would like to take it as read, wouldn't you? You would like to take it, Mr. Socialist, as read. You don't want to hear what you are doing to the people. You don't want to hear what kind of a straightjacket you are putting our farmers in. You don't want to hear how you are prostituting justice. Let me tell you, Mr. Speaker, and Members opposite, that in this country, for their knowledge, we built our system of justice on the British system and it is now the Canadian system. It says in effect that you are innocent until you are proven guilty. That you are innocent and it is up to the

Crown, to the Government, to the police to prove that you are guilty of a crime. You get your day in court and the onus of proving that you are guilty of any crime is on the Crown or the Government. But not in this Act, not with that NDP Government, not for the farmers of the province any more when they pass this Bill. Let me read this — 31B:

(i) In a prosecution for failure to obtain a licence or to pay fees, penalties or charges, the onus of proving . . .

And I repeat,

. . . the onus of proving that a licence was not required or that the fees, penalties or charges were paid, as the case may be, to the board or commission shall be upon the accused.

In other words, we will be guilty until we are proven innocent. When one of the neighbors, one of the little NDP friends who wants to get in — they have got lots of them, I'm experiencing that up in Prince Albert now, the filthiest kind of garbage in that Party that you can imagine, they put their little smut and their little innuendoes in the newspaper and hide behind something that you can't get at them — all they have to do under this Act is phone the Commission and say, my neighbor farmer Jones sold a pig and didn't have a licence. All right, what happens to farmer Jones and farmer Brown under this Act, gentlemen? I'll tell you what happens. He has to prove he's not guilty. He's not innocent like we were up to this point under British justice. He has to prove that he didn't sell that pig. Well I don't know whom he is going to prove it to or how he is going to prove it, how do you prove that you haven't sold a pig? I guess you've got to find the fellow that you didn't sell it to and get him into court as well. He would say, Mr. Judge, please Mr. NDP Judge, please Mr. Tribunal of the NDP, I am not guilty. It will be a magistrate appointed by your fellows, that's who it will be.

**Mr. Messer:** — Do you say they conduct . . .

**Mr. Steuart:** — Oh, well, I'll deal with that later, Mr. Messer, I'll deal with that later. Please, Mr. NDP Tribunal, I am not — whom did I sell the pig to? I can't bring the man here. You are guilty until you are proven innocent.

Mr. Speaker, this is the most vicious piece of legislation and it is the most vicious part of any legislation that has even been brought into this Legislature by any government.

**Some Hon. Members:** — Hear, hear!

**Mr. Steuart:** — Well, now, what about this Bill. Mr. Rolfes and gentlemen, this might have gone over in some countries, but I'll tell you something, you have gone too far this time. You have gone too far.

**Mr. Robbins:** — Like Medicare.

**Mr. Steuart:** — We defeated you after Medicare because you did go too



far. We'll defeat you after this one, too. We straightened Medicare up and you'll be defeated after this.

In 1962 I was elected in a by-election. Any time you had an election every one of your members were wiped out. Tommy Douglas was defeated because of Medicare. Mr. MacIntosh's successor was defeated because of Medicare. Do you know why you were defeated because of Medicare, because you went too far. You went too far with your control and your power and your arrogance and that is exactly what you are doing in this Bill. Some farmer said, maybe they will withdraw it. Maybe when Mr. Messer's head isn't so swelled with power and arrogance. Maybe Mr. Blakeney who doesn't sit in this House half the time, hasn't got so far removed from the real issues of this province that he will withdraw this Bill. I said, no, don't worry, they won't withdraw this Bill. They won't withdraw this Bill, Mr. Speaker, because, why? Because this is what they believe in, this is their philosophy, that they, the NDP and their so-called high-paid experts have a better plan. They are the ones who know how to run our lives better than we know how to run our lives. They are not going to give that common little hog producer, that fellow who grows 10 or 15 pigs — Mr. Messer says, let him go to a meeting, let him propose an amendment, let him stand up and put through a resolution. Well, Mr. Messer, I will tell you that these people grow hogs. They grow pigs and that is how they make a living. Putting through Resolutions, and making big talk may be fine for fast talkers like you, but they don't know how to do it back on the farm. They do know one thing, that if you gave them all of the facts, and then let them have a vote, they know exactly how they want to market their hogs or their cattle or their sheep or their bees, or anything else.

Mr. Speaker, why don't they give them a vote? We have heard on all sides what a wonderful Bill this is, how it is going to stabilize the industry. We say, fine, we on this side of the House are not against orderly marketing. We put in marketing boards when we were the Government. We never put one marketing board in, that we didn't give the producers first the facts and then a vote and then let them control it, just as they have done in the province of Alberta.

If this is so good, if you are so confident, how long would it take to let those people, who make a living on hogs, large and small, have a vote after you have given them the facts. It wouldn't take a month, it wouldn't take three weeks if you wanted to do it, in fact, it could have been done long ago and we wouldn't even be debating this Bill today. If it was good, the marketing commission or board, it would be a fact.

**Some Hon. Members:** — Hear, hear!

**Mr. Steuart:** — Let's see how happy the farmers are. Let's see what kind of propaganda the Government and their employees and some of their friends are putting out.

We have a write-up here from the Star-Phoenix, March 13th and the headlines are, "Farmers Appear to have Accepted Hog Commission." It was written by a fellow called Dennis Gruending from the Star-Phoenix. I know Dennis Gruending's background and to say the least as the most charitable thing, he is just slightly left of centre. I think he would get along real well

with John Richards and some Wafflers. He is the one that went out and covered the meeting for the Star-Phoenix.

Who conducted the meeting? Mr. Harry J. Elder of Fillmore. I'll tell you that if you gave Mr. Harry J. Elder of Fillmore the blood test it would come out beautifully red (clear NDP) and make no mistake about that. So this is the gentleman who conducted the meeting.

What does it say? Oh, yes, there was another fellow there an ag rep called Miller. He comes from the Rosthern area and we know his political stripe as well and it is NDP.

These are the people who held this meeting. I also want to tell you about these farmers that were reported in the Star-Phoenix as being happy with the Hog Commission. It says 100 farmers attended and they accepted it. Well that is pretty interesting because we talked to some of those farmers. We talked to some of the farmers who were there and let's see what they had to say.

Mr. H. E. Queery, from Dalmeny. He is a large hog producer who was at the meeting and he voiced strong disapproval of a Hog Commission without a vote. Malcolm Weir, from Aberdeen — and I think he is a Liberal, he is a smart fellow so he must be a Liberal — he has lots of intelligence, lots of moxie. That is one of the tests of being a Liberal. Now what are the tests of an NDP? You get one looking through this side and if they see each other, he is a Member.

**Some Hon. Members:** — Hear, hear!

**Mr. Steuart:** — Especially . . . Mr. Malcolm Weir, Aberdeen; he is very renowned as a hog producer. He voiced strong disapproval of this Bill.

Milton Lepp, Domremy, a key large producer, voiced very strong opposition; A. G. Guiring of Laird, very efficient farmer and hog producer, voiced his opposition.

Not one farmer, at that meeting, I am told by people who were there, spoke in favor of the Hog Commission. They were told then by Mr. Elder and Mr. Miller, they said, 'Look it is a fact — The Hog Commission is a fact — we didn't come out to say do you want it or not. We came out to tell you how it is going to work'. And they misrepresented a few facts about licensing and glossed over a few things of this kind of control and that control.

Recently the hog producers of Saskatchewan — and you are going to get lots of them, and I hope you don't pay any attention to them, because if you don't you will be back trying to make an honest living after 1975 and not sitting in those seats laughing at the people of Saskatchewan and laughing at the farmers of Saskatchewan.

**Some Hon. Members:** — Hear, hear!

**Mr. Steuart:** — But you won't pay any attention to them. Here are some more people who were at that meeting. The hog

producers of this province, at their own expense and on their own initiative — and when the Member, that school teacher, said they did it because I told them, I wish I had that much power or authority or influence. He is insulting the hog producers just as Messer has insulted them, just as Blakeney has insulted them, and everybody on that side is insulting them by saying they are too stupid and not intelligent enough to vote on how they should market the product that they produce by the sweat of their own brow.

Here are 16 people that were at that meeting and there were about 80 at that meeting. That is 20 per cent of the people who were at that meeting — 10 of whom stood up and voiced strong disapproval in spite of the fact that they were told it was too late and it didn't matter. They have filled out these coupons and they have mailed them in what have they said?

I urge the ending of the Saskatchewan Hog Marketing Commission to be delayed until a democratic plebiscite of all Saskatchewan hog producers is held to indicate support for this plan. Wally Jensen, Waldheim; R. J. Brown, Saskatoon; Peter . . ., Laird; A. J. Heppner, Waldheim; Murray Hepton, Waldheim; Bodner, Prudhomme; Layman, Rosthern; Neufeld, Waldheim; others from Oungre and Hague; Henry Glee —

**An Hon. Member:** — They are now.

**Mr. Steuart:** — Yes, some of them weren't. Some of them even sent in money for support for us to fight for the democratic rights.

Oscar Klassen, Laird; Queery, Laird; Milton Lipp, Dalmeny; Thompson, Aberdeen; Henschel, Rosthern.

Mr. Speaker, those were just some of the farmers who were at that meeting, who have taken the trouble, their own time and their own money, to send in that coupon and they have also sent it in to the Minister of Agriculture, if he bothered to read his mail or is honest enough to tell this House, or his own people, what they are getting.

**An Hon. Member:** — For or against?

**Mr. Steuart:** — Oh, we got some for. But that meeting, that is the meeting that the people employed and paid the taxes, by the taxpayers of this province, Mr. Harry J. Elder, a civil servant (I presume he is) on the taxpayers' back, working for this Government. This is the kind of a man who gets up and says, "The hog producers of this province are satisfied. They are not complaining."

Yet 16 per cent or more of the people who were at that meeting stood up and voiced a complaint, took the trouble to send in, not only to me, but to the Minister of Agriculture as well, their serious complaints, about not being given a democratic vote.

Let's see if anybody else is bothered. Yes, I will tell you how many we have, we got over 800 and we have only had the results coming in in the last three and a half days mail. You be honest and count how many you are getting in.

**Some Hon. Members:** — Hear, hear!

**Mr. Steuart:** — Some of them are letters. Take a look, there they are.

**An Hon. Member:** — . . .in the garbage.

**Mr. Steuart:** — No, they are not in the garbage, here they are.

**Mr. Speaker:** — Order, order! There is far too much crossfire going on. Let the Hon. Member complete his speech without any further interference, interference on both sides and not just from one.

**Mr. Steuart:** — Thank you, Mr. Speaker. The oil filter king should calm his nerves, swallow an oil filter and we will get on with the business.

Candiac, Stoughton, Craig, Lampman, Hodgeville, Englefeld. Here are the letters and there are some in here, Mr. Speaker, that even sent in money to fight the cause. Hutterite Brethren, Oliven, Eston; Earl Grey, Davidson — Davidson, oh, the old what you call him up there . . .

**Mr. Matsalla:** — Mr. Speaker, on a Point of Order. I wonder if we could have the Leader of the Opposition table all those letters and those little coupons that he is reading from.

**Mr. Steuart:** — No, Mr. Speaker, because I am going to answer them all and I want to keep them. But I'll tell you what I will do for the Member, the Minister or any of those Members, they are welcome, when we rise tonight, to come over and I will let them see the names of every one of them. You go and ask your Minister of Agriculture, because he has one duplicate for every one that I have, and if he is honest enough to tell you the truth, he has them and there are over 800 and before we are finished I am sure there will be over 1,000 or 2,000

**Mr. Messer:** — . . . how many are . . .

**Mr. Steuart:** — I knew you would ask that. How many? I don't know how many people the Western Producer goes to, may be it goes to 30,000 or 40,000 people, I don't know. So far 800 or over 800 people have bothered to take the time to clip this out, put it in an envelope, pay the mail.

**Mr. Messer:** — How come!

**Mr. Steuart:** — Yes, they have to you, but I am sure that maybe some of those high-priced help, Mr. Messer, that you brought in from all over are maybe hiding the facts from you. But if they are not hiding the facts, if you come out of the ivory tower, you will take a look at them because every one that I got, you have a duplicate and don't try to kid the public.

Mr. Speaker, I will let the Minister of Agriculture take a look at it. They put their names as they are not afraid to

stand up and be counted. They are not going to be bulldozed or bullied by the NDP. They have stood up and they have been counted. How many? Well, 800 or maybe we will get 1,000 maybe we will get 2,000, I don't know.

We have some that opposed. One man wrote here he wrote across it 'Hogwash' — I don't know whether he meant us or you, but he said hogwash. There is another one who put on 'Baloney'. I think he got mixed up with that people's piggery that you bought. I think he was ordering a little baloney for the weekend, I am not sure what.

We had two out of 800 who said they were in favor of the plan. Now, if this plan is so good, I will put the question back to the Minister of Agriculture. Here are the farmers of Saskatchewan, hog producer and farmers generally, because the cattlemen know they are next on the list, the sheep producers know they are the next on that list. There is no question about that! They are next and they won't get a vote and they won't get an consultation either.

If the farmers are so happy about this deal, then why didn't they take the opportunity — 700; 800 or 1,000 or 2,000 — to fill in these coupons and send them in to us or in to Mr. Messer. They haven't done it. You let Mr. Messer come in here with about 700 or 800 and say, there they are. He can read them he can take the list down and he can go and check them. They are a fact, they are not made up and they are not phony. They are real farmers who are concerned and have a right to be concerned.

I will tell you why we are not tabling them, because we are answering them. Everyone of these people are going to get an answer telling them that we in the Liberal Party favor orderly marketing, that we in the Liberal Party also favor democracy and we will give them a free, honest and open vote.

**Some Hon. Members:** — Hear, hear!

**Mr. Steuart:** — And that's their only answer, Mr. Speaker, in the final analysis, if these people won't listen to reason, if they won't back off this arrogant dictatorial course, is to stand by and work with us and as soon as they have the nerve to call an election, put them out of office.

Mr. Speaker, the Member who spoke before me on the Government side, I talked about the Intercontinental Packers — pork packers. I think that this is another building block in this plan.

I puzzled for a long time, as did many people and they are still puzzling in this province, why this Government paid \$10.2 million for 45 per cent of a packing house after offering absolutely no proof — because there is no proof — that it was going to be swallowed up or bought up by someone else. That it was even threatened. A company that is making a profit is viable — \$10.2 million of our money, not one new job, not one new cent of revenue for the people of this province, why did they do it?

I think it is part of this whole plan, because if you read the Bill and the amendments to The Natural Products Marketing

Act, you will find in there that this Commission, that is now a fact of life for the hog producers and will be a fact of life soon for the cattle producers, you will find that they can tell those people exactly, not only what kind of animals to grow, when to market them, how many to market, but they can also tell them exactly where to market and exactly how much they will be paid for them.

So the purchase of Intercontinental begins to make a little bit of sense. Mind you, Mr. Speaker, when we get the truth — if we ever get the truth from this Government — as to what the true value of Intercontinental Packers is, I tell the people of this province it will be a stinking scandal, because I have enough evidence right now that I will bring into this House, to show that they paid two or three times the price that they should have paid,. They paid \$10.2 million for 45 per cent of a company that in its total value, 100 per cent of which is not worth \$10.2 million, and we will prove this before we are finished.

**Some Hon. Members:** — Hear, hear!

**Mr. Steuart:** — So, Mr. Speaker, besides being one more link in the chain, it will bind our farmers to the NDP plan, plans for agriculture, plans for mining, for business, plans for industry, Intercontinental is just one more link and a very, very stupid and a very, very bad and high-priced link at that.

Mr. Speaker, why are they doing this? If you followed the NDP for 20 years, you have studied their pattern for the last 19 months, you will find that they can't help it. It isn't that their intentions are bad but they are absolutely convinced that the only way that we can have orderly marketing in agriculture, or oil, or chemicals, is for the government to control it. They are convinced of this. It is their philosophy. They are not ashamed of it. They say, 'of course we believe in socialism. Of course we believe in the regulations and the control of the means of production and distribution of this world's goods.' That is what they say, they never deny it. Why should anybody be surprised that one of their first moves would be to control the basic industry of this province — agriculture?

We don't have a more vital industry. If you are going to put in your plan, if you are going to put in your planned economy, then, of course, you've got to put it in first in the number one industry and that is agriculture.

So the first step, of course, is to control the land and they boast about it. I don't see some of the old farmers and the old CCFers boasting about it. I noticed that a great many of the school teachers and the Minister, who never farmed, who never worked the soil, stand up and say, 'this is a great challenge, this is a breakthrough. We will relieve our farmers of the burden of owning their own land. We will let them be tenants of the state. We will set up little commissioners all over this province to judge how they farm, which way they farm, and if, they are good enough farmers. And then we will take the next step and we will appoint a commission. Us, not the farmers, we are not even going to give them a vote.'

They try to relate this to teacher bargaining, they try

March 22, 1973

to relate it to Bill 2. It has nothing at all to do with these things. Of course, a government is elected to govern, but when you are dealing with something like this where you are taking over an industry, step by step, you don't dare give the people in that industry a voice, even if they are farmers, because you are afraid that they will stop your little plan and they will change it. Again, I say, compulsion, regimentation and absolute arrogant control have to be hallmarks of any socialist regime, of any socialist government, and they are hallmarks of this NDP Government. And this is why they will not withdraw this plan. This is why they won't change it and, Mr. Speaker, that is why they won't give our farmers a chance to vote on it. They have nothing but contempt for our farmers.

Mr. Messer says, let them go to meetings, let them stand up and make resolutions. Talk is for the likes of Messer, raising hogs is for the hog producer, raising cattle is for the farmers of this province. They don't know much about amendments. They don't know much about going to meetings and packing them and pushing through resolutions. But they are the best farmers in the world.

We, on this side, have confidence in these men that they know how they want to run their own lives.

**Some Hon. Members:** — Hear, hear!

**Mr. Steuart:** — Mr. Speaker, there is a lot more than this coming in and I want to give the farmers of this province a chance to wake up and come to and that is what they are doing. They realize what is happening and want a chance to fight back. And that is why I want to beg leave, today, to adjourn this debate because there is a lot more coming in that I want to talk about before this is over.

**Some Hon. Members:** — Hear, hear!

Debate adjourned.

The Assembly adjourned at 5:27 o'clock p.m.