

LEGISLATIVE ASSEMBLY OF SASKATCHEWAN
Third Session — Seventeenth Legislature
46th Day

Thursday, March 29, 1973.

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

INTRODUCTION OF UKRAINIAN CANADIAN COMMITTEE

Hon. R. Romanow: — (Attorney General) Mr. Speaker, I don't have any students to introduce today in the normal sense other than they are all students, I suppose. It is my pleasure today to introduce to the Members of the Legislative Assembly and to you, Sir, a group of about 30 people of the Ukrainian Canadian Committee, Saskatchewan Council, who were present this morning at 10:00 a.m. to present a brief to the Cabinet on a multi-cultural policy for the Province of Saskatchewan.

I think I can say this on behalf of the Premier and the Members of Cabinet who attended. The brief was certainly well thought out and an excellent statement of objectives as far as the opinion of the Canadian Committee is concerned. We all enjoyed our exchange and meeting with them.

They were many in number. I see that the president of the Council, Judge Korchinski, is present with us, a former Member of the Assembly.

I think that the brief is so good, Mr. Speaker, that all Members would be interested in it and with the permission of you, Sir, and the House I should like to table a copy of the brief and ask the Pages to give a copy to all of the other MLAs on each side of the House.

If I might just be permitted, I should like to say in a true spirit of bilingualism to the Ukrainians,

Me vitaim bas do Regina.

Thank you very much, Mr. Speaker.

Some Hon. Members: — Hear, hear!

Mr. D. G. Stuart: — (Leader of the Opposition) Mr. Speaker, in the true bilingualism of this House I will address the group in Irish.

I should like to join with the Attorney General in welcoming the members of the Ukrainian Canadian Committee here today. We were pleased to have had a meeting with them. We discussed parts of their brief and we are very pleased that the Attorney General is tabling this so that all Members on both sides of the House will have the advantage of being able to study that brief.

I am also very pleased to join with him in welcoming not only the entire group here today but Judge Korchinski. While we know that this is a very non-sectarian, non-religious and non-political group, we are very glad that the Judge is on our side. We haven't got too many right now . . .

Some Hon. Members: — Hear, hear!

Mr. Steuart: — . . . and we can use all the help that we can get, Mr. Speaker, moral and otherwise. I should just like to join with the Attorney General in welcoming a chance to study this very important brief and to bring greetings to this important group and wish them well.

Hon. Members: — Hear, hear!

WELCOME TO AIR CADETS FROM KAMSACK

Mr. L. Larson: — (Pelly) Mr. Speaker, I should like to introduce to this Assembly the Kamsack Air Cadets No. 633.

They are seated in the east gallery. They are accompanied by their driver and the civilian committee consisting of Alvin Thies, Orest Kluchka and William Mathew. I hope that their stay in the Assembly will be pleasant, educational and memorable. I want to wish them a safe journey home. I understand they have been travelling for some time. Welcome to the Assembly.

Hon. Members: — Hear, hear!

STATEMENT

Hog Prices Decline in United States

Hon. J. R. Messer: — (Minister of Agriculture) Mr. Speaker, before the Orders of the Day, I should like to refer Members of the Legislature to an article appearing in this morning's Leader-Post. In fact, two articles on the front page. One headed, "United States Cattle Prices Drop Fast", the other, "Cutback by Japanese Also Hits Canadians".

Mr. Speaker, this says and I should like to quote a couple of excerpts from the article,

A spokesman from the hog market in Des Moines, Iowa blamed the decline in hog prices in the United States on panic selling and lack of confidence in what the market will be tomorrow or next week.

The article goes on to say in regard to the United States hog prices,

Wednesday's price declines include a record drop in hog prices at the national stock yards in Illinois for the second straight day, tumbling \$4 on top of Tuesday's \$3 decline. And hog prices were off \$3 to \$4 in several other stock yards. Cattle prices started declining at most markets in the mid-west with decreases ranging from \$2 to \$4.

In regard to the Japanese cutback and how it hits Canadians, I should like to quote,

Jim Dawson, a livestock economist said the reason for the sudden loss of Japanese markets was not immediately known but it had resulted in some panic selling which worked to the disadvantage of the producers.

On the Toronto market, for example, usually 30,000 hogs a day are marketed at the start of each week, while recent sales have been up to 33,000 animals per day. The price reduction has hit the United States real hard with seven major markets averaging about \$33.50 a hundredweight Tuesday, down from about \$39.50. Last week's hog prices at Edmonton dropped to \$44 a hundred from \$48 and Wednesday's average quotation was \$41.45 compared with \$48.80 on Tuesday. There has been some reduction simply in the supply of hogs, Mr. Dawson said, but basically there is a lot of psychology in it.

Mr. Steuart: — Mr. Speaker, we are all able to read the Leader-Post. What is the point of this?

Mr. Messer: — Mr. Speaker, a few short days ago the Members of the Opposition were saying that the Government does not make enough announcements before the Orders of the Day. I am referring to this Leader-Post article, then making the announcement, Mr. Speaker, that if there was a hog marketing commission in the Province of Saskatchewan, these kinds of things would not come about.

Some Hon. Members: — Hear, hear!

Mr. Messer: — They would have been able to negotiate, Mr. Speaker, contracts with the Japanese, would have been able to negotiate a co-ordinated marketing system for hogs so that there would not be panic selling because of uncertainty of markets. I am simply saying that the Members opposite should allow the Government to move forward with its legislation so that a hog marketing agency can come into effect to avoid these kinds of reductions in red meat prices to producers.

Some Hon. Members: — Hear, hear!

Mr. E. F. Gardner: — (Moosomin) If we might just be allowed a word in reply, Mr. Speaker. This is about one of the most ridiculous statement that we have ever had from the Minister of Agriculture.

Some Hon. Members: — Hear, hear!

Mr. Gardner: — I don't know how he thinks that the commission in Saskatchewan, which maybe has two per cent of the hogs in North America, is going to affect the price in the United States.

I should also like to point out to him that there are boards in Alberta and Manitoba and I am sure that the price has changed exactly the same amount in Alberta and Manitoba that it is going to change here and in the United States.

Some Hon. Members: — Hear, hear!

Meeting of Prairie Economic Council

Hon. A. E. Blakeney: — (Premier) Mr. Speaker, before the Orders of the Day, I should like to make a brief statement concerning the meeting of the

four Western Premiers which will take place tomorrow and Saturday in Winnipeg.

Members will be aware that the Prairie Economic Council came into existence in 1965. It has survived changes of government in all three provinces and has continued to play a very useful role as a vehicle for discussing problems common to the three provinces and for co-ordinating programs and positions.

The meeting which will take place this week is of special significance on two counts. First, for the very first time the three Prairie Premiers will be joined by the Premier of British Columbia. I know that I, among others, will be pleased to welcome the Premier of British Columbia to the circle and to congratulate him on his efforts to restore British Columbia to Confederation.

What adds even more significance to our four-province meeting is the fact that it anticipates the unprecedented conference to take place next summer under the auspices of the Liberal Government of Prime Minister Trudeau, one might almost say, the reformed Liberal Government.

That conference is to seek ways in which the Federal Government can operate western economic opportunities. We will be covering a broad agenda in Winnipeg. I want to comment on only two areas on which the Saskatchewan delegation will be concentrating.

All Members will be aware that the Government of Saskatchewan sponsored a province-wide transportation conference in Saskatoon last week. It was a successful conference. In Winnipeg we will be making a strong case for a united western voice in support of the main message of that conference, a new transportation policy which wipes out the discrimination in transport service and freight rates which the West has suffered since Confederation. I believe our chances have never been better to accomplish this than they are in 1973.

Second, we will be urging a united position in support of a policy to introduce real stability into the livestock industry. I am talking about a better system of price supports for livestock producers, particularly hog producers. I am talking about a feed grains policy which will assure adequate and stable prices plus federal maintenance of feed grain reserves.

Mr. Speaker, we are looking forward to tomorrow's conference of Western Premiers as an important step towards a real new deal for Western Canada.

Attending the conference with me on Saturday will be the Attorney General (Mr. Romanow) and on Friday and Saturday, the Minister of Agriculture (Mr. Messer), Minister of Industry (Mr. Thorson) and the Minister of Finance (Mr. Cowley).

Mr. D. G. Steuart: — (Leader of the Opposition) Mr. Speaker, I should first like to say on behalf of the Opposition that we wish the Premier well on his efforts and his meeting with the other Premiers of Western Canada.

As you will recall, I am sure, the Western Prairie Economic Council was begun by the late Premier Thatcher, by Premier Duff

Roblin and by Premier Manning.

From time to time British Columbia did sit in as an observer and I think the movement to have British Columbia come in as a full partner, if indeed that is what is going to happen, will be worthwhile and very welcome. But even having the Premier come — I am not sure now whether he is the Premier or the Prime Minister, he used to be the Prime Minister. They retired that Prime Minister and maybe he is just a Premier now. But having him come for the meeting certainly indicates a growing interest in British Columbia and I think this is bound to bode well for the Economic Council.

I not only wish the Premier well in the points, the priorities that he has mentioned to the House today, I hope and presume that they will also be discussing the so-called two-price system policy with Alberta. We have had some rather disturbing news at what the possible price change could effect to Saskatchewan gas consumers and I am sure the Premier will be taking this question up with Alberta and with the Premiers of the other provinces in an effort to have the policy changed, at least as far as Western Canada is concerned.

QUESTIONS

Financial Post Article on Price for Meat Packer

Mr. Steuart: — Mr. Speaker, while I am on my feet I should like to direct a question to the Minister of Industry (Mr. Thorson).

In Saturday's issue, March 31 issue of the Financial Post, there is a story on the front page highlighted with the headline, "High Price For Meat Packer. Did Saskatchewan Pay Too Much For Local Firm".

This write-up goes on to confirm as far as they are able and one has to judge the material they have, the proof that they present here. But at least it is one more spoke in the wheel that is enveloping or the picture that is developing about the price paid by the Government of Saskatchewan to Intercontinental for 45 per cent of their equity which indicates that the real true value of Intercon is still about \$6 or \$7 million, not the \$23 million that the Government of Saskatchewan estimated.

However, Mr. Speaker, this will be discussed at great length later on, I am sure. In the write-up there is talk about the involvement of Mr. Gedge who is both vice president of Intercon and a member of the SEDCO Board since sometime early this year, being present at a meeting at Palm Springs.

Now my question is: Did some of these negotiations take place in Palm Springs at the home of Mr. Mendel or in California at the home of Mr. Mendel? And if so, was Mr. Thorson present and was any other Cabinet Minister and who was with them representing the Government, and what part did Mr. Gedge play?

Hon. K. Thorson: — (Minister of Industry and Commerce) Mr. Speaker, let me make it perfectly clear, if it is not already clear, that the Government of Saskatchewan always took the view that Mr. Gedge was employed by the Mendel interests who owned Intercontinental Packers Ltd., owned all of

the shares of Intercontinental Packers Ltd. And, indeed, Mr. Gedge never made any statement at any time that I am aware of that would suggest that he acted for anyone else when it came to discussing or negotiating the sale of some of those shares to the Government of Saskatchewan.

I believe that Mr. Gedge was in California. Mr. Mendel was present. I know that representatives of the Government of Saskatchewan were in California to discuss with Mr. Mendel the agreement by which the Government would acquire some of the shares.

Mr. Gedge, as I have said before, had no influence on the Government of Saskatchewan in its decision to proceed or to come to an agreement on terms which were mutually acceptable to the parties, that is the Mendel interests and the Government of Saskatchewan.

Whether Mr. Gedge had been in California or not, whether he travelled to see Mr. Mendel or not, we would have viewed his position as one of advisor and spokesman on behalf of the Mendel interests who owned the shares in Intercontinental Packers Ltd. He disclosed that fully to us. We were fully aware of it and we see nothing wrong in the relationship between himself and his employer (the company) or his relationship with the Mendel interests.

Now it is often true that a member of the Board of Directors of SEDCO either has a financial interest in a client or in a company which is applying for a loan, or in the case of a chartered accountant who serves on the Board of SEDCO may have a client who is applying to SEDCO for a loan or dealing with SEDCO in some way. We expect such directors to disclose fully their interests in that particular company. And we expect them to decline to act on behalf of SEDCO when SEDCO and its Board is dealing with such companies.

So there is really nothing unusual or unprecedented about the situation so far as Mr. Gedge is concerned and the fact that he also serves on the Board of Directors of SEDCO.

I want to say, Mr. Speaker, that in my view, Al Gedge is an honorable and honest man. And in my view, he acted honestly and honorably in respect to his duties as an employee of Intercontinental Packers Ltd. and in his relationship to the Mendel family. I repeat, again, he did not influence the Government of Saskatchewan, he did not act for the Government of Saskatchewan, he did not act on the SEDCO Board in relation to this purchase of 45 per cent of the shares of Intercontinental Packers Ltd. by the Government of Saskatchewan.

Mr. Steuart: — Mr. Speaker, he didn't answer my questions. One of the questions that I asked Mr. Thorson, and I will make it specific, was the Minister of Agriculture, Mr. Messer, present and carrying out some of the negotiations at the home of Mr. Mendel in California and was Mr. Gedge present at that time?

Mr. Thorson: — Mr. Speaker, the answer is, so far as the Government is concerned, that no Members of the Cabinet were in California with respect to this transaction. And whether or not Mr. Gedge was there or not is not entirely within my knowledge, but I

March 29, 1973

understand that he was there.

Mr. Steuart: — Mr. Speaker, I just want to clarify . . .

Mr. Speaker: — I don't think you can debate this.

Mr. Steuart: — I am not debating it.

Mr. Speaker: — I think you have had a question and a supplementary.

Mr. Steuart: — I am not debating it and I ask a supplementary question then, Mr. Speaker.

Mr. Speaker: — We have had the question and the supplementary question on this.

Mr. Steuart: — He didn't answer my first question. I asked him clearly if he was there and I presume that he said that he has not been in Mr. Mendel's home in California.

Mr. Speaker: — Order, order! A supplementary is for clarification on the first one, not a second question.

Mr. C. P. MacDonald: — (Milestone) Mr. Speaker, I should like to direct a question to the Minister of Industry.

It is very important in this deal or transaction to realize or for the public to realize that the \$10.2 million paid for Intercontinental went into Mr. Mendel's pocket for shares belonging to him and his family, not to the company.

It is also a very pertinent fact, when evaluating the facts of this sale, to know the equity position. I should like to direct the question to the Minister of Industry because he must have this answer at his fingertips. What is the shareholders' equity in the company that we, the people of Saskatchewan, purchased for \$10.2 million?

Mr. Thorson: — Mr. Speaker, I think that we have said many times and everyone knows that the Mendel interests owned 100 per cent of Intercontinental Packers Ltd. and that it was the Mendel interests that we dealt with and it was 45 per cent of their interest that we purchased.

Mr. MacDonald: — 45 per cent of what? I asked the Minister of Industry, what is the equity held by the Mendel family in Intercontinental that you bought 45 per cent of? For example, the article in the Financial Post says,

The most recent sale of a packing company in the Dominion of Canada, the price was calculated . . .

His comment on evaluation related to the insurance replacement

value as stated by Mr. Gedge.

We wouldn't touch that with a ten-foot pole. There aren't too many businessmen in Canada who would evaluate a company that way and stay in business. This packer recently purchased a small eastern packer for book value plus a little good will.

What is the equity of the total assets that is held by the Mendel family?

Mr. Speaker: — Order, order! On Tuesday last we had a motion before the House at that time asking for the complete financial statement for Intercontinental Packers Ltd., for the company's fiscal year and he listed the years. The House at that time decided by a recorded vote against that resolution. I think this has been debated and we can't bring it in on Orders of the Day questions.

Mr. MacDonald: — On a point of order, I am not asking for the financial statements of the company in any way, shape or form. The financial statements of a company include a great number of things. I am asking the Minister a very simple question. What is the book value of Intercontinental Packers?

Mr. Thorson: — Mr. Speaker, the Member for Milestone ought to read all of the statement that appears in the Financial Post if he is going to read part of it relating to a particular point. I read to him and to the House another paragraph in the context in which he has just quoted which says as follows:

Others say replacement value is a valid approach to take into consideration when working out purchase price but only when there is an income flow toward it. That doesn't seem to be the case for Intercontinental.

Now, Mr. Speaker, he knows very well what we have purchased because we told him. He knows very well what value we have put upon it because we have told him. I don't know what more I can give him other than to come in the side door as he would like us to do to reveal the financial position of the company and its internal operations to the point where that would prejudice its commercial operations and that, Mr. Speaker, we have for good reasons declined to do at this time.

Mr. A. R. Guy: — Mr. Speaker, I should like to direct a question to the Minister of Industry. He didn't answer the question of the Leader of the Opposition as to what members of the Government or its agencies were present when the deal for the purchase of these shares was made. Now he mentioned that Mr. Gedge was there. We know he is a member of the SEDCO Board. He said that he wasn't there as a member of the Government. We should like to know how he could be there as a member of the SEDCO Board and not be a representative of the Government and if he wasn't representing the Government, who were the members representing either SEDCO, the Government or any of its agencies?

Mr. Thorson: — It may well be beyond the mental competence of the

Member for Athabasca to understand that situation that somehow a man could be in California who is a member of the SEDCO Board and not be acting on behalf of the SEDCO Board while he was there. But in fact, it happens in Saskatchewan all of the time. People who are members of the SEDCO Board when SEDCO is dealing with a matter in which that person has a personal interest, decline to act on behalf of SEDCO. Mr. Gedge's role does not change with the geography. We are well aware of that and I think anybody who knows anything about this situation is well aware of that. Mr. Gedge, as far as the Government of Saskatchewan is concerned on the purchase of Intercontinental Packers shares, did not act for SEDCO or the Government of Saskatchewan and as far as we are concerned he did act for the Mendel interests.

Now I want to make it perfectly clear, Mr. Speaker, that no Member of the Cabinet was in California to discuss with Mr. Mendel the purchase of these shares. The only people for the Government of Saskatchewan who travelled to California to talk to Mr. Mendel about this transaction were the General Manager of SEDCO and the Deputy Minister of Agriculture.

ROYAL ASSENT

At 3:52 o'clock p.m. His Honour the Lieutenant Governor having entered the Chamber, took his seat upon the Throne and gave Royal Assent to the Bills presented to him.

ADJOURNED DEBATES

SECOND READINGS

The Assembly resumed the adjourned debate on the proposed motion by the Hon. J. R. Messer (Minister of Agriculture) that Bill No. 60 — An Act to provide Financial Assistance to Encourage and Promote the Development and Expansion of the Agricultural Industry in Saskatchewan be now read a second time. (FarmStart)

Mr. L. Larson: — (Pelly) Mr. Speaker, when I adjourned the debate on the said Bill I was saying something about the advantages of the FarmStart program. I think that it speaks for itself inasmuch as it opens up a completely new era insofar as agriculture and its possibilities are concerned.

We see in the agricultural industry an ever greater need and an ever greater desire for the involvement in diversification as well as the involvement of the finances that are also associated with this diversification. There have been several financial programs that have been brought into effect and all of them, as I pointed out the other day, have had a very useful and a very worthwhile impact. The time is here now when we need to add to some of these programs that have been in existence for quite some time and have become obsolete so to speak.

The new FarmStart program opens up a completely new era and a completely new sphere of development. We can no longer go along without agriculture being in position to take advantage of opportunities that arise, not only in Canada and on the North American continent, but in the foreign countries, particularly in the Pacific area. The Japanese market, as I point out, is an exciting one. It has very great potential. That potential cannot be capitalized on unless we are in a sound financial position, a sound economic position, and also in a

sound position to guarantee the kind of production that these markets demand. When you look at the possibilities in other areas of development, world population increasing, food needs ever becoming more and more a concern and a very real problem for a lot of people, when you look at all of these possibilities and the fact that Saskatchewan, being one of the few areas that has a real potential to meet this kind of challenging future, then I think we all ought to realize the importance of FarmStart and the impact that it can have not only on the Saskatchewan economy but on the Canadian economy as well as to meet the needs of the world. I said considerable about it the other day.

With these few remarks I want to say that I certainly congratulate the Minister for bringing in this Bill and this program and I'll be supporting it all the way along the line.

Some Hon. Members: — Hear, hear!

Mr. P. P. Mostoway: — (Hanley) Mr. Speaker, if the popularity of this proposed legislation can be measured in terms of inquiries on the part of farmers, then I can truthfully say this this proposed legislation is good. I say this because already I have received many inquiries from farmers and potential farmers in the Hanley constituency. All have shown great interest in this proposed program which will aid our farmers to reach the desired amount of diversification so that they may be better able to ride out the years when cereal grains are not so easily sold.

If I may be allowed to deviate, Mr. Speaker, may I say that if the Leader of the Opposition (Mr. Steuart) thinks that I should not be allowed to speak for farmers on this or any other issue, let me remind him that I was brought up on a farm and I have the callouses to prove it. I think I know, but I should like to ask anyway, where are his callouses? I venture to say that they are not on his hands.

Mr. Speaker, I support this Bill which once again shows the concern of this Government for those who toil on our farms. I will support it.

Some Hon. Members: — Hear, hear!

Mr. J. C. McIsaac: — Mr. Speaker, just a few words on this particular Bill 60 that is before us, the FarmStart program. I said earlier in other debates in this House that I would support any legislation that the Government put forth to strengthen the livestock industry and enhance the development of that industry in this province. I believe that this legislation is designed for that and probably will do a good deal, Mr. Speaker, to boost the livestock industry in Saskatchewan.

There are several points in the Bill and in some of the remarks of the Members that I should ask the Minister to clarify in closing debate. I am frankly still not sure, Mr. Speaker, whether the Crown corporation that is being established in this Act will in itself be making the loans directly in all cases to the farmers involved. I should like to have this point clarified. In another section of the Act reference is made to approved lenders, I presume that banks, credit unions and so on may well be utilized in some manner in this Act as well. Perhaps I didn't read the Bill properly or carefully enough or listen intently

to the Minister by I would ask him to clarify that point in closing debate.

My one concern — there are a number of concerns in the Bill — why do we need a Crown corporation to administer a program of this kind? The Minister is adding staff to his department continually. He had got a pretty good field coverage of the province through Ag Rep offices and various other offices, Mr. Speaker, and I question whether or not we need another Crown corporation to do what this Bill is designed to do. It is interesting to me, Mr. Speaker, there was a motion, perhaps there still is, on the Order Paper that sought the co-operation of Provincial and Federal Governments in tying together the Land Bank and the Federal Small Farms Development Plan, it sought co-operation along those lines. Now in this particular Bill here we see the Provincial Government setting up a Provincial Crown corporation, a provincial farm credit structure, if you like, when already across the province we do have a federal farm credit structure, offices, fieldmen, staff and so on. Here would have been, I think, an excellent opportunity for the Government, for the Minister opposite, to co-operate with the Federal Government in this respect to put this program in some manner related or tied to staff and the capabilities of the farm credit staff. It seems to me that farmers are going to be faced with going to one place for some assistance from the Family Farm Improvement Branch or any of their programs, they go to another place to deal with farm credit, they will go again to another office to deal with crop insurance — there is a structure being established for that — and they will go again to a different office, quite aside from the Ag Rep offices, to deal with the FarmStart program. This does disturb me, Mr. Speaker, I don't think it is necessary. I think there are ways and means that could avoid some of the duplication of structure and services that this will result in.

I do quarrel, as I say, with the need for a Crown corporation. I also quarrel with the figures given by the Minister in his second reading. There were the 1966 census figures when he pointed out, I believe, that only 11,000 farmers out of 85,000 at that time would be excluded from taking advantage of the provisions of this Bill. May I suggest, Mr. Speaker, that on the basis of the 1971 census I would venture to say that about one-third of Saskatchewan farmers will be unable to take advantage of this program. It seems to me that this is an unnecessary kind of restriction. A man can have at his disposal \$100,000 total assets in grain farming. For one good reason or another, either slow grain sales or whatever may come up, he may wish to involve himself in a livestock operation. He is going to need credit to do that and he is going to be denied the provisions of this legislation. All of the previous programs, Mr. Speaker, that this Act will basically replace, Livestock Loans Guarantee Act and similar Acts, they were never restricted in that sense. They were available to all farmers in the province. I agree and concur with the question of restricting the grant, that makes sense. I would support that but I see no reason why the loan program, the advice and the servicing in this respect, the consultative services that I understand will be going with this, why they should not be made available to any and all farmers in the province.

I was somewhat disturbed by the remarks a few days ago in this debate, Mr. Speaker, by the remarks of the Member for Assiniboia (Mr. Lange). Now he seemed to think and his remarks

led me to believe that he thinks this Bill will give the Government power or authority to go out in the fall of the year, buy heifer calves from the ranchers in his country, in turn put them out, or farm them out if you like, to other farmers in the district to winter them and then in turn allow the Government to get involved in selling heifers for replacement the following spring. Mr. Speaker, I suggest to my hon. friend from Assiniboia — he is not in his seat, I wish he were — that if he wants to find a short cut to not coming back here, just go down to Assiniboia in the ranch country and made that kind of a speech, that the Government is going to use this kind of a program to dabble directly, not dabble, but get directly involved with the cattle industry. The very steps and the kind of thing that he spoke of is now going on and has been handled successfully by the private sector in the livestock industry and I suggest, Mr. Speaker, they don't need any Government involvement in this respect.

Again, I would ask the Minister to comment on the fact that using his 1966 figures the percentage of farmers left outside the purview of this Act was not that great I'll agree. But I would remind him that I think on the basis of 1971 figures he will find that perhaps there is a third of the farmers and it seems to me that this is restrictive. While the Bill generally is good and its directions I certainly support, I should ask him to reconsider the restrictions in that sense.

Some Hon. Members: — Hear, hear!

Hon. J. R. Messer: — (Minister of Agriculture) Mr. Speaker, as I think the Members have expressed previous to my closing debate on this Bill this is, I think, a revolutionary Bill for the Province of Saskatchewan. It provides credit that has never been applied in areas in which farms are in need for the future. I note that there has been no real solid opposition to it. The Member from Wilkie has brought up some points that I think could probably be clarified in more detail in Committee when we go through the Bill clause by clause. However, I will, in a general sense, attempt to answer some of the concerns that he has mentioned.

I believe the first concern he registered was as to why we had to have a Crown corporation in order to provide this kind of service to farmers in Saskatchewan. Generally speaking, our reason for this is that the kind of credit that we will be making available will be made available to farmers that in the large sense have not had the opportunity for this kind of credit in the past. The normal lending institutions that have been providing credit up to this time to farmers have had to require more collateral than these people were able to muster together. They did not have the kind of counselling services that the FarmStart program will have. They did not have the repay options that the FarmStart program will have. We say in the FarmStart program, for the benefit of the Members opposite, that when there is economic hardship encountered by a farmer who has obligations under the FarmStart program, economic hardship that was generated by conditions beyond his control, that we will waive the payment of loans for any given year and amortize them and tack them on to the end of his 15 year period. It is a bit difficult, I think, for the lending institutions to make a blanket agreement in that regard because they have obligations to their head offices and I can see bank managers all over

Saskatchewan confronted with great problems if they have to explain to their Winnipeg head office that they can't collect money in a certain region because a hail storm went through there or because of grasshoppers or something like that. The Government, I think, on the other hand when it brings in a program like this has some responsibility in indicating to farmers when they borrow large sums of money, the maximum may well be \$60,000 here, that if a farmer is confronted with problems that he has no control over, we are not going to hold the axe over his head and say, either you pay at the end of December or else we are going to have to start foreclosing on you. That is one of the reasons that I think most of the money will be given out through the FarmStart program rather than through the banks. I am not saying that the banks will not have an opportunity to provide credit, they will in fact be able to, but when we see a program where it is closely attached to counselling and great flexibility in regard to repayment as it related to the generation of money from that farming enterprise, we see some problems with the banks, in fact lending the money and having to subject themselves to that kind of flexibility as a third party. We say the FarmStart program should not only provide the money but it should provide the counselling and the other expertise as well as the flexibility so that it is a farmer talking with a representative of the FarmStart program only so that there would be continuing harmony.

I believe that the Member also made some remarks in regard to Federal-Provincial co-operation. I should like to say to him and to the Members of this Legislature that we have discussed with the Federal Government some co-operating in regard to FarmStart. Not only in the counselling but in the funding, more towards the grant portion of it than to the provision of money because we feel that the grants should be eligible under DREE, the ARDA portion of DREE for the development of farms in Saskatchewan. We have not got any consensus of opinion from the Federal Government as to whether they will participate in that area. They recognize that FarmStart may perhaps be eligible for that kind of money but as it is expressed to me by the members of the Federal Government, the administrators of the program, they have some real problems themselves with the Federal Department of Agriculture being separated from the Department of Regional Economic Expansion in Ottawa. When you take the ARDA program falling under the Department of Regional Economic Expansion and the Department of Agriculture federally having different program, they have some problems working out at that level as to what is really eligible for agricultural expansion and development. When the provinces come forward with programs it is a third party that has some other problem. We are at this point in time trying to work out problems and their concerns for agriculture. I hope that in the future FarmStart will be able to relate to federal activities in various provinces and also that it will be recognized by the Federal Government by grants of money toward this program. But whether it does or not we have made a commitment as a Government in Saskatchewan that we will provide the FarmStart program and staff it totally with provincial appointments and funds and also make the money and the grants from the Provincial Government available to farmers.

I think there is also some reference to the scattering of offices and services. I recognize that is a problem. I believe the Member mentioned crop insurance, FarmStart, Land Bank and the like of that. This is one of the reasons that along with

this the department announced some while ago, two weeks, maybe ten days, a re-organization that is going to take place where we are going to move a lot of our centralized staff who are now sitting mostly in Regina out to six regions in the province. We are going to break those regions into six other regions so that we will have headquarters located in various regions of the province so a farmer will be able to look after most of his concerns as he searches for advice about FarmStart, the kind of engineering expertise that he needs to build facilities for a livestock enterprise on his farm or whatever it may be. We will not be shuttling them down from one office to the other, we wish to co-ordinate all activities in relation to developing his farming operation.

The last comment that the Member made I think was a question as to why we did not provide more money and why perhaps we have restricted it at \$60,000. I think, firstly, we have to keep in mind that the Province only has so much money to budget for its total activities. The Department of Agriculture is only going to get a certain share of that. When we take a look at those farmers who are in need we think that \$100,000 gross productive assets is a farm that should be able to get credit from other sources. Anything less than that the FarmStart program will be of benefit to him.

I must also say that we have to recognize that in its development years and especially its first year, it has already been indicated by all Members, both Opposition and Government, that it is an attractive program. We don't want to generate too much optimism in farmers that they will all be able to get a loan in the FarmStart program in the first year. We are hoping that the \$60,000 maximum loan, the \$100,000 gross productive available assets will put us in a position that we can not only develop a new program that needs new policies, new regulations and the like of that, but be able to handle those applicants who apply within the guidelines of that program. It is obvious that in years to come we are going to have to raise that from \$100,000 gross productive assets to \$150,000 and perhaps higher than that. I think that we are going to have to raise the amount of the loan from \$60,000 to something higher than that. But to start with we think this puts us in the ball park of being able to handle the kind of clientele that are now contacting us.

Having made those remarks, there is one other area that I do want to mention before I close. This program is not restricted to livestock alone. We say that we will be giving emphasis to livestock this year because we want to develop a livestock industry in Saskatchewan so the FarmStart program will give first priority to those kinds of developments. But it does not say that it will not recognize other expansion of agriculture, specialty crop production, specialty machinery and the like of that. We have recognized the need for priority consideration on the east side of the South Saskatchewan River Irrigation Project. FarmStart will be tailored with a provision of giving extra money to people who are in that area for irrigation recognizing that it costs more money to set up that kind of farming operation than it does for dry land operations. We also realize that their gross productive assets will be greater than \$100,000 so that we will lift the ceiling in the area of the SSRIP.

Mr. Speaker, I think that, in general, answers some of the

March 29, 1973

questions that some Members have been asking in regard to this Bill. If they have other question, we will be more than happy to go into them when we go into Committee of the Whole, but I think it is safe to say and will be agreed upon by all Members that this is a new piece of legislation, it has tremendous potential, not only for farmers in Saskatchewan, but to generate moneys which will be for the well being of all people who live in this province. I move second reading, Mr. Speaker.

Some Hon. Members: — Hear, hear!

Motion agreed to and Bill read a second time on the following recorded division.

YEAS — 50

Messieurs

Meakes	Whelan	Feschuk
Wood	Kwasnica	Flasch
Smishek	Carlson	Steuart
Romanow	Engel	Coupland
Messer	Owens	Loken
Snyder	Robbins	Guy
Kramer	Tchorzewski	Grant
Thibault	Taylor	Boldt
Larson	Matsalla	MacDonald (Milestone)
Kowalchuk	Richards	McIsaac
Baker	Faris	Gardner
Brockelbank	Cody	Weatherald
MacMurchy	Gross	MacLeod
Pepper	Feduniak	McPherson
Michayluk	Comer	Lane
Byers	Rolfes	Wiebe
Thorson	Oliver	

NAYS — 00

Messieurs

Nil

SECOND READINGS

Hon. E. I. Wood (Minister of Municipal Affairs) moved second reading of Bill No. 59 — An Act to provide for the making of Grants to Certain Elderly Persons to assist them in making Repairs to their Homes.

He said: — Mr. Speaker, I should like to rise to move second reading on The Senior Citizens Home Repair Assistance Act, 1973. This program will provide grants up to \$500 to senior citizens residing in their own homes for repairs and improvements to their homes as indicated in the Act.

Some Hon. Members: — Hear, hear!

Mr. Wood: — Under this Bill these grants will help to upgrade older homes in rural as well as urban Saskatchewan. It will assist the elderly to reside in their own homes by making the home

safer and more comfortable to live in and will provide employment during the winter months to unemployed or to under-employed tradesmen and contractors.

Mr. Speaker, there are in Saskatchewan approximately 95,000 persons in receipt of the old age security pension. Of this number approximately 45,000 or 47 per cent reside in their own homes. The existing housing and social assistance programs do not adequately meet the needs of senior citizens on a low income level who own their own homes and wish to continue to reside in their homes. The proposed legislation will provide a service which is not available to the bulk of home-owning senior citizens under the Social Assistance program or the House Building Assistance Grant program or under the National Housing Act.

Pensioners at present may be granted assistance under the Social Assistance program to repair their homes but the number of pensioners to whom this assistance is available is relatively small. Of the 95,000 pensioners in Saskatchewan approximately 2,850 are on Social Assistance. Of this number only 350 reside in their own homes. In other words, the Social Assistance Plan is able to assist only 350 of approximately 45,000 home-owning pensioners in this province. The House Building Assistance grants provide assistance for major structural alterations costing \$2,000 or more. While some pensioners may qualify, this program does not help those who need only a few hundred dollars to repair the roof or install a bathroom or carry out some other essential repairs to make the home more comfortable. Nor is the National Housing Act providing assistance of the kind which the proposed legislation will provide for our senior citizens. Most of the 45,000 pensioners are left to their own resources in making repairs and improvements to their homes. The fact that some 25,000 of the pensioners are in receipt of full or partial guaranteed income supplement is a clear indication that their resources are very limited. To such people the expenditure of even \$200 or even \$300 on the repair of their homes is a major undertaking which few can afford. To them the only alternative to living in an old dilapidated, uncomfortable or unsafe house is to obtain accommodation in a publicly sponsored senior citizens residence.

Mr. Speaker, this Bill as I have presented it to the House, does not contain the program in total. Much of it is left to regulations.

An Hon. Member: — No bother . . .

Mr. Wood: — That's right, it is a time honored principle that has been in effect since other governments were in power.

I have proposed regulations which, of course, cannot be passed until the Bill has been passed but these regulations have to be tied to the amount of guaranteed income supplement that is given over and above the old age security pension. I understand that the Federal Government, at the present time, is proposing a change in the old age security pension. Any regulations that I might bring in at this time might be valid only for a few weeks or months. It is, therefore, the reason why I am not able to bring down a set of regulations that I could put on the table before you.

I can indicate very clearly to the House today our intention in regard to regulations on this program. This program will make grants available to all applicants who are in receipt of the guaranteed income supplement to their old age security pension. The Federal Government determines the amount of the supplement which is based upon the pensioner's income. The amount varies from year to year. It is, therefore, intended to establish by regulation a maximum home repair assistance grant that may be paid to any applicant. The grants will vary from \$200 to \$500 depending upon the amount of the guaranteed income supplement that the pensioner is receiving.

Mr. Speaker, any person who is simply in receipt of the old age security pension with no guaranteed income supplement would not be eligible for assistance under this program. Those who are in receipt of the full guaranteed income supplement would be eligible for the maximum payment under this program. We will set forth by regulation a schedule of amounts that will be payable to each citizen in that category in regard to the work that they may do. We will be paying 100 per cent of the cost of the repair within the amounts that are available to those pensioners. This amount will be, as I said a minute ago, dependent upon the amount of income supplement that they are found to be entitled to by the Federal Government.

It is intended to make this program a part of a winter works package. The work to be done must be done after provincial approval has been given. We will not be paying in regard to work that is done before it has been approved by the department. Secondly, it has to be between the dates of November 1 and May 31 of next year. It will be initiated, we expect, next fall. Both critical and minor home repairs will be eligible. Critical repairs are those which increase the life expectancy of the house such as repairs to the roof, foundation, doors, windows, etc., repairs or replacements of heating systems, repairs or additions to electrical or plumbing system, an alteration of or any addition to or reconstruction of original housing where the present structure is inadequate. Minor repairs which improve the appearance of the house include such jobs as painting, tiling, plastering, etc. Both of these types of work will be eligible for assistance under the program.

Mr. Speaker, I want to point out to the House that this is an excellent program which will be of real assistance to many of the home owning senior citizens in the province and will provide employment to hundreds of people who would otherwise be unemployed or under-employed during the winter months. I would move second reading of this Bill at this time.

Some Hon. Members: — Hear, hear!

Mr. J. C. McIsaac: — (Wilkie) Mr. Speaker, I should like to make a few brief comments on the Minister's remarks on second reading of Bill No. 59.

The Minister himself did mention, I think, that this Bill perhaps takes the prize for being a piece of legislation. I am not quarrelling with the intent or the principle but with as it is written and put together. One section, section 3:

The Minister may make one or more grants to an applicant in respect to the cost of the repair of an eligible residence in accordance with the schedule of grants as

approved by the Lieutenant-Governor-in-Council.

That is the whole Bill right there, that section. There is absolutely no detail whatsoever anywhere along the line in the Bill. A limit of \$500. The Bill itself is cited as The Senior Citizens Home Repair Assistance Act and yet nowhere in the Bill is there any reference made to the fact that the program is indeed designed for older people. There is nothing in the Bill where it is defined. The Minister gave us some specifics in the regulations that he intends to implement and attach to this Bill but as a piece of legislation it says absolutely nothing which states how it intends to or what it is supposed to be doing and leaving everything entirely up to the Minister. I think it does take a first prize in that regard among the number of Bills that have come in here from both sides of the House through the years.

Mr. Speaker, the Bill will certainly receive my support and the support of Members on this side.

The previous Liberal Government introduced a grant program some years ago for the construction of homes and initially, if my memory serves me right, those first houses were for Indian and Metis people off reserves. And it was probably the first major step, if you wish, of this Provincial Government or the Province assisting in home construction. That program was extended. The program to pay a \$500 house building grant initiated by the previous Liberal Government is another housing program which again was expanded and added to by way of size of grant and so on under the present Government. So the present Bill before us really extends that principle of assistance in the construction of houses which has been with us for some time to the question of repairs and repairing of housing for elderly people.

I think, Mr. Speaker, we have, certainly, no quarrel with the Bill. I hope and I think that when we get into Committee, may I suggest to the Minister that by that time, April 1, the new pension law will have been in effect. He will be able, I hope, to bring us the regulations because it is pretty difficult to debate the specifics in the Bill because there aren't any. There is only one fact that is set out in the Bill. I would hope when we get to Committee he would have the regulations and we could then discuss a number of other points that came to mind as I listened to the Minister introduce the Bill.

Mr. K. R. MacLeod: — (Regina Albert Park) Mr. Speaker, I only have a few words on this Bill. It is, as my friend from Wilkie (Mr. McIsaac) has already stated, the kind of a Bill that is a masterpiece in its simplicity and a masterpiece in how little it tells us. There is virtually nothing at all in the Bill and I observe that from embarrassment, I believe, the Hon. Minister found it necessary to explain some of the regulations without which he would have little or nothing to say at all in support of this Bill.

I observe that it is intended to limit the eligibility entirely to those who are qualified to receive the guaranteed income supplement according to the regulations of the Federal Government.

In this, the Bill is a piece of prejudice. There are many

people who are, frankly, on the borderline, who do, in fact, come nearly to qualifying for the guaranteed income supplement but because they did not quite get themselves to the low point of income that they qualify, they get nothing at all out of this particular Bill. That means that someone who does qualify is able to use this Bill for his benefit and those who are in the lower income categories get no benefit whatsoever.

I suggest that it falls far short of what one did expect when I first saw the Bill. And certainly, it is prejudicial to those people who find that they do not even own homes but have been obliged instead to rent property. There is nothing there to assist the person who is in a rental situation, who cannot even afford to own his own home and, as a result, may well be paying more in rent than is the old age pensioner living in his own home.

I, therefore, suggest that this Bill, if anything, is designed to save the Government money rather than to spend any great sums at all on our old age pensioners.

However, I am prepared to support the Bill and will do so, but I wish to express my disappointment at how little this Bill does, in fact, for the old age pensioner.

Mr. H. H. Rolfes: — (Saskatoon Nutana South) Mr. Speaker, I would just like to take a few minutes in speaking to this Bill. In the speech that I made earlier in this Session I referred to the housing corporation as mentioned in the Speech from the Throne.

Although this Bill doesn't give us all the details on how the Government intends to implement the particular proposal, I really can't follow the logic of the Member from Albert Park (Mr. MacLeod) in saying that this Bill falls short of his expectations. What expectations are you looking at? There is nothing that limits the Government in fulfilling all the needs that there are for those people who need housing. It is again a sweeping statement, a confusing statement by the Member for Albert Park. On the one hand he says this Bill is really short in meeting its requirements, and on the other hand he says he supports the Bill.

The Bill outlines that low income and middle income people will be eligible. And yet he says that the Bill will save the Government money in implementing it. I really don't follow your logic.

Mr. Speaker, earlier this year I did mention that low and middle income groups in Saskatchewan and especially in the cities really need assistance in housing. I am hoping that this Government will look at the situation that exists and fulfil those needs.

From the little research that I have done, I have found that approximately 55,000 units in Saskatchewan or over 20 per cent of the total housing stock are in need of rehabilitation and renovation. 55,000 units! This percentage is approximately one and a half times as large as that for Canada as a whole. I don't think that this Government can take any blame for the disastrous situation that we're in. About 70 per cent of these units needing repair are in rural areas and small communities

in the province. In these small centres and farm areas, the percentage of inferior units is twice as large as the major urban centres in the province. It is likely that many of these dwellings cannot be economically rehabilitated and that alternative housing will have to be provided. I think that this Bill will help in the meantime at least to repair those homes which don't need replacement in the near future.

Saskatchewan's housing situation is serious as I have mentioned before. I hope that this Government will have a very serious look at the total situation and that the Minister will see this as only a first step in coming through with programs that will help to replace run down shacks and also to use this particular avenue as a way of creating employment.

Senior citizens, Mr. Speaker, are people who have earned their reward and have borne weight in society. I would hope that this Government will continue the progressive legislation that it has so far enacted to help senior citizens and that it will in the regulations extend as much as possible the policies so that as many senior citizens as is possible can qualify for repairing their homes.

I agree with the Member from Albert Park insofar as the Bill might not go quite far enough for those people who don't quite qualify for the guaranteed income supplement. But where are you going to make the cutoff? That is the problem. If you cut it off \$100 below then why not the person at \$101 below? And why not the person at \$105 below? I think the Government has made its decision and I, for one, should like to see the program given a try. If it needs changes, hopefully, the Government will bring in amendments and extend the program.

For these reasons, Mr. Speaker, I certainly want to put it on the record that I support this Bill and hope the Minister will put it into effect as quickly as possible.

Mr. MacLeod: — Mr. Speaker, before the Hon. Member takes his seat I wonder if he would answer one question. I wonder if the Hon. Member is aware that in the constituency of Regina Albert Park more than 50 per cent of the people live in apartment buildings, many of whom are old age pensioners, not one of whom will benefit by this legislation?

Mr. Speaker: — No. That is not a question, that is a statement.

Mr. W. A. Robbins: — (Saskatoon Nutana Centre) Mr. Speaker, I should like to make one or two very brief comments.

I commend the Minister and the Government for bringing in this type of legislation. It is obvious that old age pensioners really do need some assistance particularly with regard to housing programs.

I am getting a goodly number of letters at the present time related to the prospect of this Bill coming in. I would concur in one remark that the Member for Albert Park made with respect to who qualifies. I realize there are problems related to simply limiting it to people who may qualify under the

guaranteed income supplement and old age security.

One of the problems is that people who have struggled very hard to save a little bit of money and stay in their own home often do not qualify for GIS and find themselves in a difficult position when it comes to maintaining that home. If it is at all possible in terms of the regulations I would urge upon the Minister to attempt to find some way to help those in this category. I might say I also find it very refreshing to find a good point in the speech of the Member from Albert Park. It is a rare occasion when that kind of situation arises. I do, however, commend the Minister for the Bill and sincerely hope that he will give close attention to that particular point when the regulations are drawn.

Mr. Wood: — Mr. Speaker, it has been indicated that this a very short Bill and that it contains nothing in it. I should like to say, Mr. Speaker, that I think that the very nature of the Bill makes it desirable that we are able to do some of the things that we wish to do under this Bill without coming back to the Legislature in all cases. The case in point right on the fact of the thing is the fact that the stipulations as to who may qualify under this Act may be changed very soon. And if we brought in a Bill that had been printed up under the situation as it was when this Bill was first contemplated we would now find it entirely out of date, possibly after the first of April when the Federal Government is intending to bring in new legislation concerning the old age security pensions. The Hon. Members have brought forward other changes that they would propose in the regulations. I think that it is desirable to leave some room for the Government to act on these things and not have the full program tied down tightly in legislation before we start. I am sorry that I wasn't able to put a copy of regulations before the House due, as I said, to the situation at the present time. We hope to have pamphlets put out on this as soon as possible to enable the general public to know exactly what the Bill is all about. I have, in my remarks today, outlined what our full intentions are when implementing the regulations.

The Hon. Member from Albert Park (Mr. MacLeod) has indicated that this Bill is a piece of prejudice in that it cuts out those who do not qualify, that just for the lack of a few dollars or because they have a few dollars they will not qualify under this Bill. I want to point out that it was not our proposal to make this assistance available to everyone who is 65 years of age and is in receipt of the old age security pension because there are a good many people in the province, as the Member for Albert Park is well aware, who do not need this sort of assistance at all even though they are 65 years of age. I don't think it is really desirable at this time that we should include them. It is a little difficult to make the assessment and we felt that we should be prepared to give the most help to those who were in the most need. We would taper the amount down so that because of the fact they they were not in receipt of the guaranteed income supplement they wouldn't be losing the whole \$500, they would be losing a smaller amount. Those who just get a few dollars of income supplement would not be qualified for the whole \$500 because they had made a few dollars. We won't be cutting them off from the full \$500 but we shall be treating

them very much the same as those who were in receipt of a small amount of the income supplement.

The Hon. Member has also said that there is nothing to assist those in a rental situation. Well, with a repair Bill such as this I really can't see how we could be prepared to assist those in a rental situation because I don't think the Hon. Member would expect us to be spending this money to assist landlords. That is the only way that I could see that we could be spending money on a house that is being rented out to people on a guaranteed income supplement. If we are going to help the renters in some way, it can't be done, I submit, in a Bill that provides assistance for repairs to a home. That would not be assisting the renter but it would be assisting the landlord. I think even a lawyer should be able to see that.

The Hon. Member from Albert Park also says that this will save the Government money. I fail to see in what way that it could. This is a statement that I fail to understand. The budget is for \$3 million for this year. It is expected that this program over the next few years will likely cost the Government some \$10 million, but \$3 million for this year. I think this will be well received and appreciated by the people of the province, these elderly people. I cannot see how this is going to save money for the Government. I wouldn't say that it is not money well spent because the returns to the people of the province are going to be of a very large nature and worthwhile. Simply the matter of having these premises repaired and put in a good condition for these old age pensioners, I think, is a wonderful and good thing to do. I think it will do much for the province and will provide many returns to the Government as well as to the people of the province. It is not, as I say, in the matter of money, I don't think we will be saving money on it, although I think we will be making a very good investment for the Government and for the people of the province.

The Hon. Member from Nutana South (Mr. Rolfes), Mr. Speaker, said that he hopes that we will be improving housing in other ways. Well, I certainly want to assure the Members of the House that the setting up of our corporation, the Saskatchewan Housing Corporation, is with this in mind. We expect to be moving in many different ways to help the housing in Saskatchewan in a way that has never been done before. I don't know that the House would desire me to go into that today because that is really not the topic we have before us. But I want to assure the House that this is only one of the programs that we shall be putting into effect and it is our intention to see that all people of the Province of Saskatchewan will have assistance to help them to live in good accommodation. This is our intention.

The Member for Nutana Centre (Mr. Robbins) is suggesting that we should be going along in extending this program to those who are on the old age security. As I pointed out earlier I don't think you can term these regulations as a piece of prejudice in cutting off people who have happened to save a few dollars. I do say that we shall be considering in the days and months ahead whether we can and whether it is advisable to bring in a different approach to make this assistance available to more in the province. I can assure the Hon. Members that if it looks as if this is a desirable thing to do that we will surely give it consideration.

March 29, 1973

With these remarks, Mr. Speaker, I should like to again move second reading of this Bill.

Some Hon. Members: — Hear, hear!

Motion agreed to and Bill read a second time on the following recorded division.

YEAS — 51

Messieurs

Blakeney	Whelan	Lange
Meakes	Kwasnica	Oliver
Wood	Carlson	Feschuk
Romanow	Engel	Kaeding
Messer	Owens	Flasch
Snyder	Robbins	Coupland
Kramer	Tchorzewski	Loken
Thibault	Taylor	Guy
Larson	Matsalla	Grant
Kowalchuk	Richards	Boldt
Baker	Faris	McIsaac
Brockelbank	Cody	Gardner
MacMurchy	Gross	Weatherald
Pepper	Feduniak	MacLeod
Michayluk	Mostoway	McPherson
Byers	Comer	Lane
Thorson	Rolfes	Wiebe

NAYS — 00

Messieurs

Nil

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, and the proposed amendments thereto by Mr. MacDonald (Milestone).

Mr. J. C. McIsaac: — (Wilkie) Mr. Speaker, yesterday the rules of the House interrupted my speech as I was getting into my initial remarks and again I review the amendment that is before us for the benefit of Members opposite and as to why this amendment was introduced and why we are asking the House to give full consideration to that amendment.

This Bill itself has only been before the House for something less than a month for debate. We have criticized the principles contained in the Bill, Mr. Speaker, we have criticized them on every occasion because we think the powers are too severe and too great, completely unnecessary for the Government to be seeking at this point in time or at any point in time. They have not given us any reason or any justification as to why the Minister of Agriculture feels it necessary to have these powers written into the law of the land.

Mr. Speaker, one of the points that I did not bring out yesterday in my remarks is the fact that the Minister has given us no real details of the proposed Hog Marketing Commission that he proposes to initiate and to adopt under this legislation. We have not seen any details of the plan. I suggest, Mr. Speaker, that if and when this legislation passes, the next day the Minister will come out with details and specifics of a plan. I suggest he has those specifics now and has not put them before the House. That is why the Member for Milestone (Mr. MacDonald) has moved this amendment to refer the subject matter of this Bill to a committee of the Legislature for further study.

I go back again to the day the Minister introduced this piece of legislation. He introduced it on March 1. He introduced it the day after the Attorney General rose before the Orders of the Day to tell this House and people of the province that the Government had just moved into the meat packing business by buying a 45 per cent interest in Intercontinental Packers in Saskatoon. Now, Mr. Speaker, the Minister of Agriculture, in the course of his remarks in introducing this Bill, went on to point out that the two, more or less, went hand in hand. In other words, he is seeking powers and he is heading off in the direction of a marketing commission, owing a packing plant and regulating the entire hog industry or indeed any other livestock industry — the cattle industry will, no doubt, be no different — but it is a fact that the Government did purchase an interest in Intercontinental and leaves one to wonder . . .

Mr. Speaker: — Order! I think that the amendment calls for the subject matter of this Bill to be referred to a committee. I would hope that Members won't start discussing Intercontinental or other Bills because it is the subject matter of this Bill which the amendment deals with.

Mr. McIsaac: — Mr. Speaker, my only point here, and I appreciate your concern in this regard, but I am going to try and demonstrate because I am convinced in my own mind that there is a connection very definitely. An article from the Financial Post on March 31 goes on to point out and to indicate that the Government appeared to pay more for Intercontinental . . .

Mr. Romanow: — On a point of order, Mr. Speaker. You brought my learned friend, the Member from Wilkie to order once and on a point of order I would respectfully request that you do so again. The Member from Wilkie, disregarding your observations, is now talking about a Financial Post report upon the value of Intercontinental. What has that got to do about the amendment, Sir, about the special committee? The Member has already spoken on the main motion. He is supposed to have taken the opportunity to talk on the main motion and not take that opportunity on the amendment. I say to you, Sir, would you please call the Member to order on this point. He has got to confine his remarks to the arguments for or against, I assume he is for because he moved the amendment for setting up the special committee.

Mr. Gardner: — On a point of order, Mr. Speaker. I believe that the Member from Wilkie is trying to indicate the reason

why this should go to committee. The reason that it should go is because the Government has gotten involved in Intercontinental and the farmers are concerned about this. These are recent developments and this is an argument for sending this particular Bill to committee. This is the case he is trying to make. If we weren't able to argue this type of thing, why would we want to send it to committee?

Mr. Speaker: — The points of order are running into the debate. This is an amendment which is debated concurrently with the Bill. There are a number of Members who have spoken on the Bill. They have spoken to the subject matter of the Bill and I gave considerable latitude of debate at that time because this debate was referring to Bills that were brought down last year. But this specific amendment says that the subject matter be referred to a special committee and I would ask Members to stay to this Bill and not discuss Intercontinental Packers or the Land Bank or other such Bills because that isn't what this amendment calls for. Members who have not spoken on the Bill, their latitude would be somewhat wider because they have not spoken on the main Bill. I would ask Members, I know it is difficult, but I would ask Members to try to keep to that point.

Mr. McIsaac: — Mr. Speaker, I appreciate your comments. May I say, Sir, that one of the reasons, one of the concerns that I have in seeking to send this Bill to committee is the Government move with respect to Intercontinental. According to a recent press release and this just came into my hands today, not yesterday, I couldn't have spoken on it yesterday, I do have to wonder at the haste of the Government getting into Intercontinental and that to me is one more very valid reason why the subject matter of this Bill dealing with the licensing, the production, the marketing of hogs, cattle or any other product should be referred to a committee. I think it is doubly more important today that this Bill should be referred to a committee in light of the concerns raised by this article in the Financial Post with respect to the Government's interest and haste, the acquisition of that interest in Intercontinental Packers. Mr. Speaker, I appreciate and will try and relate to the Bill and amendment and I think I have related. To me it is a very relative matter, these two particular facts. If we were looking at the Bill alone, the question of referring that to a committee is one thing, yes. I think we have to recognize the Government's move with respect to the entire meat packing industry. They are going to go into the meat packing, distribution, sales and so on and, as I say, they are completely vertically integrated if you like, insofar as agriculture is concerned by the passage of this Bill.

It seems to me, Mr. Speaker, that a Bill this important in light of the Government's involvement in almost every other step of the way in hog production or cattle production and marketing, it is all the more important that this Bill be indeed referred to a committee, be it a select standing committee or a special committee that could well be established.

Now, Mr. Speaker, today we see in the Leader-Post some reference to the fact that hogs and cattle prices are slipping in the States. Some mention was made earlier that is a reason to hasten and hurry this legislation. Mr. Speaker, that is a complete red herring. What may or may not be happening . . .

Mr. Romanow: — On a point of order. I again must rise on a point of order because the Hon. Member from Wilkie is now making reference to a remark that was not made during the course of debate on this Bill that I know of. It was made not during the course of this Bill and even if it was that doesn't relate to the matter that is before you, Sir, with reference to a special committee. I repeat again, Sir, my point of order. I think the Member from Wilkie is totally out of order when he drags in all these other issues. I ask you, Sir, to call the Member from Wilkie to order on the merits or demerits of the special committee on which he has said very little in his entire remarks thus far this afternoon.

Mr. Boldt: — Mr. Speaker, surely to goodness the Minister of Agriculture today made a debate of a reported statement. It wasn't a statement he brought into the debate calling it before the Orders of the Day and he was making a statement that hasn't entered into the debate. It is new material and the Hon. Member from Wilkie is commenting. The Minister said because the prices of hogs in the United States and Canada are going down it is all the more reason why we should have Bill 50 come into existence. This is the argument and I am positive that the Member from Wilkie is in order.

Mr. Romanow: — Mr. Speaker, all that the Member from Rosthern says may very well be true if the Member from Wilkie had not spoken before on the main motion. As I understand your ruling, there is a latitude in the debate because it runs concurrently and he can bring in all sorts of comments. That's not the case of the Member from Wilkie. He is, in effect, using this amendment to redebate the whole second reading principle, an opportunity that he had well over two weeks ago. I say, Sir, he took advantage of it. Please, he should be reminded to be kept to order on the amendment.

Mr. MacLeod: — If I may on that point raised by the Hon. the Attorney General. I suggest that a reading of the amendment itself would resolve much of the difficulty. The amendment reads this:

That this House declines to proceed with this Bill . . .

These are the significant words:

. . . until the subject matter thereof has been investigated by a select special committee of this Legislature.

Now, Mr. Speaker, it seems to me that what the Hon. Member from Wilkie is doing is addressing himself to those matters which are the subject matter of the investigation, things which the special committee would wish to consider in rendering its verdict. Now it is true, Mr. Speaker, that in doing this he is going to have to consider the relevant factors. Now, Mr. Speaker, it has been said by the Hon. the Attorney General that the comment made earlier in the day by the Minister of Agriculture was some other debate. Mr. Speaker, that would be giving it far more credibility than it deserves because that was not part of any other debate. It was, in fact, Mr. Speaker, a blatant violation of the rules of this House. He wasn't

making any statement at all and he should properly have been ruled out of order.

Mr. Messer: — On a point of order. With regard to the remarks of the Hon. Member from Albert Park (Mr. MacLeod), I believe that I have the opportunity before the Orders of the Day to make any kind of announcement I want to make. It was only several days ago, Mr. Speaker, the Members of the Opposition, the Leader of the Opposition (Mr. Steuart) said we don't make enough statements on behalf of the Government with regard to attitudes and opinions of this Government. That's simply what I was doing this morning and I think I retain that right as a Minister of the Crown.

Mr. Lane: — No, you don't!

Mr. Messer: — Yes, I do!

Mr. Speaker: — Order! I think we are getting away from the point that was raised altogether. We are getting into a different debate.

Mr. McIsaac: — Mr. Speaker, may I make a point of order with respect to myself?

I referred to the Minister's remarks before the Orders of the Day. It was not a debate, it was not another debate, but I think what the Minister said, and I think that the press releases which I hold before me, is pertinent to the motion and the amendment that's before us. I see no reason, there is no rule surely, Mr. Speaker, that prevents one from bringing in new material in support of that amendment. I again point out that the Minister was not in a debate when he made those remarks before the Orders of the Day.

Mr. Speaker: — The point of order raised by the Attorney General (Mr. Romanow) that this item which is now being referred to by the Member from Wilkie (Mr. McIsaac) as referred to by the Minister of Agriculture (Mr. Messer) earlier this day, that was raised on a Minister's statement, not in a debate which I would not allow to be debated. While a lengthy reply did come to some extent which also got into a debate.

It is against the rules to refer to a previous debate of this House, but not necessarily against the rules to refer to a Minister's statement. But I would say that referring to other Bills or other work of this House from other debates and again I should like to mention such things as the Land Bank, Intercon, or other things are out of order because it's not the subject matter of the Bill.

Mr. McIsaac: — Thank you very much. I want to relate the headline before me here as one more reason why this Bill should be referred to a committee to study this entire question, the subject of the Bill, the question of licensing farmers to produce, to market, the question of whether or not they should be fined for not having a licence. The headline: "US Hog-Cattle Prices Drop Fast". And it goes on and I'll quote several paragraphs from it:

The National Farmers' Organization has told its members to withhold hogs, cattle and lambs from the market starting today because of a record drop in hog prices and a decline in cattle prices. The falling prices came as plans for a nation-wide meat boycott next week gained support.

The dateline on this is New York.

San Francisco, Wednesday, some two hundred persons paraded to the Federal Building . . .

I'll quote another couple of statements, Mr. Speaker, from different people.

Ron Jarvis, president of the Hope and Armour Industries of Kansas City, operators of one of the biggest cattle herds in the US said, this has to be the impact of what they call consumer resistance.

I'll go to another paragraph, this time from a wholesaler, this time a quotation from a wholesaler in the meat packing industry:

I have already cut my herd by half because I can't cover expenses, said wholesaler Sam Outbest. I have been in business 45 years and have never seen the price of meat so high. Slaughter houses are losing money, butchers are losing money, I'm losing money and still the housewife has to pay more.

Now, Mr. Speaker, I suggest because of this concern at the present time in Canada, we have a federal committee studying the high cost of living and meat certainly is a commodity which is involved. Meat is one of the questions that has been in the minds of consumers or the increase in meat prices. May I just point out here the same thing is going on in the States. There are many changes in this industry.

Here is the Government involved in the industry from the ground up, right through the packing plant and marketing. We are saying, at this point in time, with the changes that are going on and the consumer resistance that's developing here as well as in the States, that the entire subject matter of this Bill should be sent to a committee, should be sent to a committee for study.

Now, Mr. Speaker, at that time the Attorney General could even come, he could come and present the case for the way the Government has been trying to handle this thing, the meat packers themselves could be there, farmers and farm groups, everybody, consumers could be there. I think, Mr. Speaker, this is a matter that deserves much further and much deeper consideration than this Government has given it so far. I still maintain they do not really recognize the seriousness of the measures that they are asking this House to approve.

The Minister tells us that he has consulted the hog producers throughout the province. I suggest, Mr. Speaker, that he has not consulted in a meaningful way with the hog producers in Saskatchewan.

I have here a copy of The News Optimist of March 16. I am sure the Member for The Battlefords (Mr. Kramer) has read

March 29, 1973

this or had a look at it. The headline reads: "We Are In For A Commission Whether We Like It Or Not."

Hog producers want vote on marketing plan. Hog producers in the near future will be receiving registration forms for marketing their animals under the Saskatchewan Hog Marketing Commission farmers were told Tuesday.

That's in Turtleford.

Some 50 producers in attendance were almost, without exception, violently opposed to the establishment of the Commission which will be responsible for marketing all slaughter hogs grown in Saskatchewan. The Commission chairman . . .

And I'm quoting again from the release, Mr. Speaker.

. . . the Commission chairman, Harry J. Elder of Fillmore said the marketing plan could go into effect in the next two months after April 1.

Mr. Messer: — What has that got to do with this Bill?

Mr. McIsaac: — Mr. Speaker, the article goes on to point out some of the comments and some of the remarks and some of the concerns that were raised at that meeting in Turtleford. 50 producers (it wasn't a large meeting), but I say again, the press report tells us that they were unanimously opposed to the Minister's plan.

The Minister has come into the House and tried to tell us that farmers across the province are in support of the scheme he is putting forth. He obviously hasn't been to Turtleford, Mr. Speaker.

Mr. Speaker, oddly enough we haven't heard from the farm Members opposite as to why they want these particular powers in this Bill.

Mr. Speaker: — Order!

Mr. Romanow: — Mr. Speaker, I draw again to your attention, Sir, I have been listening very carefully for the last five minutes to what the Member for Wilkie has been saying and he talks about Turtleford and how the farmers in Turtleford are opposed to this. He quotes, non sequitur, out of quotations from the newspapers, he does not relate his remarks, except every time I get up to point out the point of order, in any way to the committee.

Mr. Speaker, will you please ask the Member to come to order and cease his irresponsible conduct in this House?

Mr. Speaker: — I am going to ask all Members to try to stay within the rules and the motion before us, the referring to a committee, and it is the subject matter of the Bill and stay as close to that as possible.

Mr. McIsaac: — Mr. Speaker, I respectfully suggest my remarks are in order, have been in order and will be. If the Attorney General wants to get up and get in this debate, why doesn't he do so? He's had ample opportunity and from the opposite side, whom have we heard? Whom have we heard from? The Member for Turtleford (Mr. Feduniak) hotel owner, Mr. Mostoway, a school teacher.

Mr. Romanow: — Mr. Speaker, on a point of order.

Mr. Speaker: — Order! I think that is getting away from what the motion is before us, as to who has spoken. I think the Hon. Member should stay with the Bill, not who has spoken.

Mr. Boldt: — Mr. Speaker, on a point of order. We have the Attorney General getting up and calling the Member to order and calling you to order all the time. I want to tell the Attorney General that it's the Government that appointed the Speaker.

Mr. Speaker: — Order! There's a Member on his feet on a point of order. Will the member sit down, please.

Mr. Boldt: — Mr. Speaker, for the last five or ten minutes the Attorney has got up on his feet and tried to . . .

Mr. Speaker: — Order, please!

Mr. Boldt: — The point of order is that the Attorney General is always getting up and telling the Member from Wilkie that he is out of order. He's telling you to call order. I am suggesting that the Government has appointed you as Speaker and you run this House and if not let them get another Speaker.

Mr. Speaker: — Order!

Mr. Romanow: — Mr. Speaker, to that . . .

Mr. Speaker: — Order! I recognize the Member for Turtleford (Mr. Feduniak). He has been on his feet.

Mr. M. Feduniak: — (Turtleford) Personal privilege. The Member from Wilkie made some untruthful remarks about me. He is calling me a hotel owner. I never owned a hotel in my life and it should be withdrawn. If he knows what's good for him, it should be withdrawn. This is the type of thing, this is the type of remarks I have been listening to from that Member . . .

Mr. Speaker: — Order!

Mr. Feduniak: — . . . all evening.

Mr. Speaker: — Order! I think Members need to reflect on what is before us so that they can come to order without always having to involve the Speaker.

March 29, 1973

It is now 5:30 and I leave the Chair until 7:00 o'clock this day.

The Assembly recessed until 7:00 o'clock p.m.

Mr. McIsaac: — Before we adjourned for the supper hour, Mr. Speaker, I was pointing out some of the reasons that have arisen as recently as yesterday and today as to why it is now particularly urgent and important that this Bill be referred to a select standing committee or some other form of legislative committee for immediate study and attention.

I was wondering and asking why we were not hearing more from the farm Members opposite in the course of this debate in consideration of this request and I've been glancing back at the people who have spoken and have entered the debate originally and find that very few of the Members opposite who did see fit to come into the debate were actually farmers. The Member for Redberry (not with us tonight) (Mr. Michayluk), a retired school teacher, the Member for Nipawin (Mr. Comer), I believe an active school teacher, Mr. Mostoway, the Member for Hanley, again a teacher. The Member for Watrous (Mr. Cody), I'm not sure of his occupation, Mr. Speaker, but I believe he's a filter dealer, someone says. I'm not sure whether that's Filter Queen, but he's not a farmer. I believe it correct to say he is not a farmer. This, Mr. Speaker, leads me to ask why we haven't heard from some of the farm members opposite. It leads me to ask where has the Member for Assiniboia (Mr. Lange) been in this debate. He represents a lot of farmers, cattle owners, as well as hog owners, a large segment of livestock men in his particular riding. The Member for Notukeu-Willow Bunch (Mr. Engel), we haven't heard from him and he represents an agricultural riding and his constituents, I know, are concerned about the drastic powers that the Government is seeking in this legislation. We haven't heard from the Member for Gravelbourg (Mr. Gross) in this debate. He, again, represents a large area, a lot of cattlemen, a lot of livestock men are numbered among his constituents and I would hope he would get up and tell us why the Government is seeking these powers and why indeed they are not prepared to accept this amendment and refer this entire issue to a legislative committee.

Mr. Speaker, the proposals before us to license farmers, the proposals before us to bring the Government directly into the production, as well as the marketing, as well as the processing of livestock, natural products, are serious and far-reaching amendments if they are given approval at the present time.

Some Hon. Members: — Hear, hear!

Mr. McIsaac: — Mr. Speaker, I suggest Members opposite should get in this debate, should tell us why they are seeking these powers, why it is that they are rushing and attempting to rush this particular Bill through the House at this point in time.

Mr. Speaker, I have had letters, I have had phone calls, I have had personal communication with a number of my constituents and others over the last week or two or more with respect to the subject matter of this Bill. Farmers, particularly hog producers, because that particular commodity has been singled out by the Minister for action at this time,

establishment of a commission, most of the people who have been approaching me, my constituents and other, have been men who are interested in the hog industry. I could take a few moments, a few only, Mr. Speaker, to read a few of the names that are representative of the coupons and of the calls and of the letters that I have received on this question and I won't take the time of the House to go through all of them at this point in time, but again, these are producers that are concerned about the powers that the Government is seeking in this particular legislation. They are producers that are asking that the Government not proceed with this Bill at this particular time. This is one that just came today, a Mr. Paul Gottlieb, Box 131, Denzil, who urges the implementing of a Saskatchewan Hog Commission be delayed until a democratic vote of all Saskatchewan hog producers be held indicating support for this plan. This is only one aspect of the present proposal before us that could and should be discussed and discussed thoroughly at committee meetings that could be set up, would be set up pursuant to the motion, the amendment that we are now debating. I have another one from Mr. Jerome Jansen, another constituent of mine, Box 31, Unity. Again, "I would urge the implementing of the Saskatchewan Hog Commission be delayed until a democratic plebiscite of all Saskatchewan hog producers is held to indicate support for this plan." A similar representation from Mr. Leo Becotte, Senlac. I don't know how all of these people voted in the past, Mr. Speaker, but these are concerned constituents. They are not necessarily Liberal membership holders, far from it. I'm sure they will be if the Government persists in its attitude in this particular Bill. A Mr. John Shroh, Box 119, Luseland. I believe John lives very close to the border of my constituency and Kerrobert-Kindersley. Mr. Bert Seiben of Denzil urging that the commission this Bill proposes not be proceeded with. Bert Seiben, I'm not sure how this gentleman voted in the past but I'm convinced we could solicit his support and get his membership, no problem at all. Mr. Arnold Schultz, a farmer who lives considerably south of Unity, again, fairly close to the border of Kerrobert-Kindersley constituency. A Mr. Inkster . . .

Mr. Engel: — Does he grow hogs?

Mr. McIsaac: — Yes, he does. A Mr. Inkster and he raises hogs, a farmer from Luseland. Mr. William Pogemiller, again, a farmer from Luseland who has a large number of hogs, has a large number of cattle and has been an active livestock farmer for many, many years. These gentlemen are concerned, they are concerned about the subject matter of this Bill and they are concerned that their objections to the Bill be heard. I suggest to you, Mr. Speaker, that the one approach that will allow that would be the action of the Government in the motion that we are now debating, that this Bill be referred to a committee, be it a select standing committee on agriculture or some other form of special committee set up for the purpose of investigating these complaints and investigating any other complaints and concerns that are now coming to the fore in the eyes of the producers of this province.

I have a letter here from a gentleman in Primate, Mr. Alex Kohlman, Box 69, Primate:

I am opposed to the Saskatchewan Hog Marketing Commission and I would like to have it delayed until all hog

producers have worked out a plan that will meet with their approval and not have our Saskatchewan Government do all of the planning on their own.

This has been characteristic of this Government since it came to office, Mr. Speaker, and that characteristic has been exemplified particularly well in their attitudes, in their action with respect to their plans for the hog producers, cattle producers of the province. Mr. Speaker, Mr. Kohlman goes on to say:

This Bill is definitely not in the interest of the producers of Saskatchewan.

A Mr. Art Wood from Unity, Saskatchewan, again, another gentleman who has been in the hog business as well as the dairy business for a number of years. A Mr. Allan Orr, north of Unity, up close to the Cutknife constituency, who has recently gone into hogs and has always had a good cattle operation. He, too, is concerned that this Bill not be proceeded with and that instead it be sent to a committee or the Government take the Bill back, or in any event, give some consideration to the views of the producers.

Mr. Speaker, I suggest that if the Government did send this Bill to committee it would provide them with an opportunity to re-assess the entire situation with respect to marketing. The marketing of farm products is a very serious and a very vital matter to these producers and indeed to all producers. After all, if we are going to have a good and a worthwhile scheme, surely it will depend on having a scheme that is accepted by the producers, not one that has been put together and thrown at them by the Government opposite. I find it hard to believe the Government spent something like 18 months trying to develop and devise a system of collective bargaining for teachers and trustees and they did consult on all sides, and why they will not take the same step here and set up a legislative committee and study this question and try and get some of the suggestions, some of the ideas, some of the input from producers themselves. I suggest they will come up then with a scheme that will be acceptable, that will be saleable and one that will be of value not only to the people of the province generally but particularly to the producers of livestock products in Saskatchewan.

Surely, it is their welfare, Mr. Speaker, it is the livelihood of these producers. Naturally they are vitally concerned and yet this Government proceeds along the path they have set out and along the lines contained in the Bill before us without seeking any advance consultation from hog producers. Not only that but the kind of consultation that the Minister had has not been consultation in any way, shape or form. It has not been meaningful and he is misleading himself, misleading the Government and misleading the people if he tries to put forth that by holding a series of meetings, largely on the east side of the province, that he is sampling the feelings and the opinions of hog producers on his particular hog commission scheme.

They are not answering any questions, Mr. Speaker, as to the details of that proposal and we are then asked to pass a

piece of legislation giving the Government the right to license farmers, the right to engage in production and marketing at every step of the way, without being told, without being advised as to why the Government is seeking the powers that are contained in the Bill before us.

Mr. Speaker, there are many other Members on this side of the House and I am sure there are farm Members on that side of the House that will want to avail themselves of the opportunity to get up and tell us why they are seeking these powers and tell us why they are insisting on this, tell us why they are not prepared at this point in time to send this very vital matter to a committee to study and give it the kind of attention they have been giving other issues. I think of the Land Bank, I think of a variety of issues, small businesses, welfare, liquor legislation, all of these items have been referred to committees by this Government and I commend them for it. Here is an issue that has generated a great deal of concern and they are refusing to give this issue the same kind of consideration.

May I again, Mr. Speaker, urge some of the Members opposite to get up and tell us why they are seeking these powers and why they have not agreed to accept this particular amendment before us.

Some Hon. Members: — Hear, hear!

Mr. E. F. Gardner: — (Moosomin) Mr. Speaker, I had hoped that in the absence of some of the Cabinet Ministers that the backbenchers over there would take this opportunity to do what they would have liked to have done all the time. They have been sitting there very frustrated for the last month and itching to get up but they know the Cabinet Ministers are looking over their shoulders at them. This would be an excellent opportunity. The Member for Gravelbourg (Mr. Gross) represents an area where there are a number of cattle.

Mr. Speaker: — Order! I am going to have to ask the Member to discuss the Bill and not what one of the Members should or should not be doing. We must keep to the Bill and to structured matter.

Some Hon. Members: — Hear, hear!

Mr. Gardner: — Mr. Speaker, I was really just trying to get support for my point. I was trying to convince them that they should vote with us.

Mr. Speaker, farmers are, of course, concerned and are becoming increasingly concerned about this particular Bill and about the contents of this Bill. As my colleague pointed out, this is really the need for a committee. Now my colleague mentioned a number of farmers in his constituency and I might say that I have received a very large number of objections already. These are only from the former NDPers, the Liberals haven't started sending them in yet. Some Members opposite have suggested that you have to be a large farmer or a large hog raiser to send these in and are asking how many hogs these people own. The little people are just as concerned as the big ones. We are not concerned about the large hog producers as you people are. You seem to talk about the people who only have

March 29, 1973

two or three hogs as if they don't count, but these people may want to increase the herd that they have. They may want to have more at some time and they should have an opportunity to speak their minds and to send in the coupon if they like and indicate that they would like the Bill delayed and that they would like to appear before a committee and would have some say also.

Now, Mr. Speaker, early in the proceedings on this Bill, the Minister of Agriculture sent out a letter concerning the hog commission. I have a copy of this letter here. It is dated February 9, 1973 and I think that it is very pertinent. I am glad the Minister is back in his seat because this letter was written by the Minister and has his very distinctive signature on the bottom of it. This is dated February 9 and he is indicating some information that he is trying to get out about the Hog Marketing Commission. I should like to mention a few parts in this letter because I think this is the reason for some of the concern that farmers have had and the concern that is building up throughout the province. He starts off by saying:

In light of rumors and contradictory information relating to the newly established Hog Marketing Commission . . .

Now I don't know where they have got the contradictory information because they haven't had any information of any kind from the NDP up to this time. They haven't had any information of any kind. I don't know where he heard about the rumors or whether they started them themselves. I haven't heard any and certainly haven't heard any contradictory information. I don't know why he has this in this particular letter.

An Hon. Member: — Refers to the Bill.

Mr. Gardner: — Well, this certainly refers to the Bill if anything does. If it doesn't then why did the Minister send it out? He's the one who sent this out. He goes on to say:

The Government was asked by representatives of the Saskatchewan Hog Producers' Association, Saskatchewan Swine Breeders' Association, Federation of Agriculture, the Saskatchewan Wheat Pool and the Nation Farmers' Union, as well as many individual farmers to implement a provincial hog marketing agent.

Now the Minister will have a chance to get up in this debate and if he has got all of these requests, and he says he has in the letter here, I hope that he will produce these requests. He must have letters from hog producers, swine breeders, Federation of Agriculture, Wheat Pool. These are all well known, worthy organizations and if he has letters from these people and from as he says here, many individual farmers, I should like to have him produce these letters. Now we are prepared and my colleague has already produced some of the information from people who want this delayed until a vote is called so I think it would only be in order that if the Minister is going to counter these that he would produce some evidence that people want this commission. So in order to do that all we ask is that he show us the correspondence from all of these organizations. He says right in the letter that they have asked for it and if he has, in fact, got requests from these people, he should be able to show them.

Now he also goes on, Mr. Speaker, to indicate some of the reasons why he thinks action should be taken quickly. Some of these I am not going to go into because they are a bit ridiculous but I should like to mention one or two. He says, for example:

Saskatchewan hogs are being used to force down hog prices in Alberta, Manitoba, and Ontario where hog marketing agencies have been in operation for some time.

Now this is a pretty serious type of charge. If he is saying that somebody, he doesn't say who, but somebody is using Saskatchewan hogs to force down the prices in Alberta, Manitoba and Ontario, if this is correct the Minister should get up later in the debate . . .

Mr. Speaker: — Order! I think the Hon. Member spoke on the debate once. He is now answering the debate of the Minister in opening. That is the subject matter of the Bill being referred to a select committee. I would hope that Members who have spoken, if they wish to counter what other Members have said, would do it at that time, and not now when this does confine the speeches somewhat of members who have already spoken.

Mr. McIsaac: — Mr. Speaker, surely a letter from the Minister of Agriculture deals with the subject matter of this Bill, one that certainly could be referred to in a debate of this kind. The Member for Moosomin has not had the opportunity to develop his full argument but surely comments on any letter from the Minister of Agriculture in connection with this Bill is a subject that has every right to be brought into the debate at this particular time.

Mr. Messer: — Speaking on a point of order, I believe the Member from Moosomin said the letter was written by myself on February 9. He had an opportunity to speak in the debate on this Bill since that letter was dated and sent. If he did not take the opportunity to deal with that letter at that time he should not have the opportunity to deal with it when he is speaking to the amendment in regard to the committee.

Some Hon. Members: — Hear, hear!

Mr. McIsaac: — On the point of order. That's not a point of order at all. We haven't yet heard the full argument of the Member from Moosomin. He is relating this to the amendment and he hasn't yet had the opportunity.

Mr. Speaker: — Order! We can't have an argument across the floor. I am suggesting to the Member that having spoken once that he cannot be debating what other Members have said. He should be asking that the subject matter of this Bill be referred to a committee which the amendment calls for and not trying to answer points raised by others either in an earlier debate or outside of this House.

Mr. Gardner: — Well, Mr. Speaker, I

March 29, 1973

certainly won't refer to anything that the Minister or anybody else said in any previous debate. I realize that would be out of order.

The Minister does say in this letter that the establishment of a producer board requires by law a plebiscite which would result in a delay of a year or more. Now surely, Mr. Speaker, it wouldn't be necessary to take a year or more to hold a plebiscite. They have been talking about a hog commission or one apparently set up in November, certain people were appointed to this board. They could have easily by now had a plebiscite and this is one of the concerns of the people. This is why they want to have this Bill sent to committee so they can appear before the committee and indicate to the Minister that this particular material should be discussed by the committee and they would have the opportunity to ask for the plebiscite they want. The Minister, in his letter, has said that a producer board requires by law a plebiscite which would result in a delay of a year or more. And, of course, this is certainly a bit far fetched.

I am going to go on and look at one more aspect of this letter. We are again referring to the Bill in this letter. He says:

With the proposed amendment which has been placed before the Saskatchewan Legislature . . .

This is Bill 50.

. . . have the power to control production.

I will refer to this in a moment. I would suggest that some of you people, in fact, get the Act out. Get it in front of you and take a look at it because you have been listening to some of the speeches of the Minister or some of the frontbenchers, or perhaps the Cabinet has talked to you in caucus but you haven't really looked at the Act. Take a look at it. The Minister has said, as I say, that it will not have the power to control production. He underlines again:

The commission has neither the power or the desire to limit the production of any producer.

Now, Mr. Speaker, I think that this is certainly a very important point, one that we should take a look at very, very closely. He has, as I say, underlined the word "not" and I've referred to this letter. I should like you to take a look at the Bill itself, the Bill and the amendments because we are amending a particular Bill. If you will notice, for example, that section 23 which is the main section that has been changed. I hope some of you people at the back will take a look at this because I am sure that you are really not aware of this. Section D, this is the section that is being changed, says and I will quote from the original Bill and then I'll tell you what the amendment says. Section D says:

To fix and collect charges for services . . .

This is the power of the commission not the board.

Mr. Speaker: — I must insist that the Bill was passed last year. It is not before the House. It is Bill No. 50, the subject matter of this. I cannot permit you to go back and discuss a Bill that was passed last year.

Mr. McIsaac: — Mr. Speaker, on a point of order. Surely, when one is talking about the amendment before us one must of necessity go back to the previous section that is now being amended. And in order to discuss the amendment, surely, it makes sense and it doesn't contravene rules if the Member should outline the provisions of the existing section, the one that is being sought to be amended. I surely hope you would reconsider this, Mr. Speaker, because how in the world can one talk about the amendment without making it clear what the original motion was or the original section was?

Mr. Speaker: — The motion that is before the House is that Bill No. 50 be referred to a committee, not the Bill that we had passed last year. I ruled at the start that this Bill must not be debated section by section. It was the subject, the general subject matter of it. We can't go into debating clauses of the Bill from last year. I can't permit that.

Mr. Gardner: — Well, I believe I can do it, Mr. Speaker, then by looking, if we are interested in the subject matter of this Bill, I will refer only to the subject matter in Bill 50 and I would like to refer to section 4 of this Bill, Bill 50, which is section 23 and this is what B says, it is changing section F, and again, I find it hard to understand how I can talk about the changes in the subject matter of this Bill which is to amend the Bill without referring to the previous Bill but I will attempt to do so. It says:

... to issue licences and to fix and collect licence fees, charges for service rendered by the commission and penalties from all persons . . .

Mr. Messer: — Mr. Speaker, on a point of order. My understanding is that the Member for Moosomin has already had an opportunity to speak to the amendments to the Bill. We are now speaking to the amendment that was brought in by the Member for Wilkie. He has to restrain his remarks to the amendment, not to the Bill which he has already taken the advantage of the House in speaking to. I would ask you to bring him to order in his remarks now.

Mr. McIsaac: — Mr. Speaker, the Minister doesn't have a point of order and he knows it. He knows it! The motion says that the subject matter of the Bill be referred to a committee. How in the world can you get up and talk about it without talking about the subject matter of the Bill and that is exactly what the Member for Moosomin is doing. That is exactly what he is doing. I suggest, Mr. Speaker, you ask the Minister of Agriculture to sit down and not interrupt the debate and let my colleague carry on.

Mr. Romanow: — On a point of order, Mr. Speaker. I have the floor Mr. Member for Rosthern (Mr. Boldt). On a point of order, I want to repeat what the Minister of Agriculture said with respect to the Hon. Member from Moosomin wandering off the topic. The topic is that this Bill not be read a second time but be referred to a special committee of the Legislature. That is the topic of the matter. Now what the Liberals are doing and what the Member for Moosomin, in particular, is doing is they are trying every conceivable mechanism of stalling the progress of this Bill irresponsibly and they are out of order.

Mr. Speaker, on the point of order, every Member has the duty when he gets up to address the House to stay within the rules of the House. The rules are that he is to speak to the amendment. The Liberals are not only breaking the rules every time but they are flaunting the very basis of democracy in this Legislature by their proceeding today.

Some Hon. Members: — Hear, hear!

Mr. McIsaac: — Mr. Speaker, my friend the Attorney General just walked into the House. Proceedings were going along. He doesn't know what we are talking about and he proceeds to get up and flail his arms and flail his hands and yak. Mr. Speaker, I again refer to the amendment that is before us. He can ask the Clerk for a copy. It says very definitely in the amendment that the subject matter of the Bill be referred to a committee. And that is what the Member for Moosomin is talking about, the subject matter of the Bill before us. I contend, Sir, that his remarks are in order.

Some Hon. Members: — Hear, hear!

Mr. McIsaac: — Definitely, his remarks are in order. That is a key point. And no matter what the objective behind this debate is, it has got nothing to do with the Attorney General. We don't need his opinion on that.

Mr. Boldt: — Mr. Speaker, when we look at the amendment, if you want to hold us just to the amendment, then we can't speak on anything at all. If we can't speak about the Bill, we can't speak about the amendment.

Mr. Speaker: — Order, order!

Mr. Boldt: — The point that I want to make is that if you want to keep us just to the amendment as written down on the Order Paper then, actually, you won't allow us to speak on it at all. If we have spoken on it during second reading then we brought in the amendment and as far as I am concerned we have the right to discuss every clause and item in this Bill that is the subject matter that we are talking about. I am not going to have the Attorney General tell us what to do. We have had enough railroading from that side of the House, 45 to 15 at all times. They can do exactly what they want. If they want to close the debate right now they can do it. I should just like to challenge them to close the debate right now.

Mr. J. G. Lane: — (Lumsden) Mr. Speaker, on a point of order. I think that the Attorney General and his constant interruptions with no point of order on which to base the interruption very conveniently ignores the amendment which was stated and which is before the House and which is on the Order Paper. I think probably the best thing that could happen to the House is that the Attorney General takes his blue book and goes outside the House, sits down and reads it. And secondly, Mr. Speaker, on the point of order, that the amendment states that the subject matter of this Bill go before a select standing committee. Now the Attorney General ignored that but, Mr. Speaker, the Attorney General made a point that we are breaking the rules of this House and we are doing it constantly and, I think, Mr. Speaker, it would be proper for you, yourself, as the person who runs this House and is responsible for order in this House, remind the Attorney General that the rules are not made for the Government. The rules are made for the protection of these people who want to criticize the Government and not for the Attorney General and his arrogant Government. The rules are made for participatory democracy . . .

Mr. Speaker: — Order! State your point of order. We must get going on something else.

Mr. Lane: — I think, Mr. Speaker, the point of order is that we are right in speaking on the subject matter of this Bill and that the rules are to protect those who oppose or criticize the Government, not for the protection of the Government.

Mr. Speaker: — At the beginning of this debate, I said that this was a concurrent motion and it would be debated concurrently along with Bill No. 50. Those who have not spoken on Bill No. 50 would have a fairly wide latitude because they had not spoken. Those who have spoken have had a chance to discuss the Bill in detail clause by clause and so on. So I ruled at the beginning that the subject matter of Bill No. 50 was open for debate for those who had spoken before but not clause by clause, but they could refer to the subject matter, and Members can have a wide scope of discussion without bringing in the clauses for the Members who have spoken. I hope that we can go along those lines because I think we shall facilitate the debates and at the same time maintain better humor in the House if we can do that.

Mr. McIsaac: — On a point of order, Mr. Speaker. Are you saying, Sir, correct me now if I misheard or misunderstood you, that there are two sets of rules for Members on this debate?

Mr. Speaker: — The rule is that, and Beauchesne makes it plain, a person can't speak on the same topic twice, even by moving amendments you can't speak on the same topic twice. But I have said in order to discuss this amendment Members must be permitted to discuss the subject matter of the Bill. But I am asking the Members who have spoken to stay away from the clauses because they have exercised their right on that one point. Beauchesne says you can't through amendments discuss the same topic twice. I am trying to be as lenient as I can to facilitate the debate.

Mr. McIsaac: — Mr. Speaker, I suppose the interpretation, and I think it is an interesting point really. If we say that the subject matter of the Bill, what you are really saying carried to its extreme if you like, is that the subject matter of the Bill doesn't involve the clauses. And I don't know how in the world, Mr. Speaker, we can talk about the subject matter of the Bill without making some reference to the clauses.

Mr. Messer: — He had the opportunity to debate those clauses.

Mr. McIsaac: — No, but the point is, Mr. Speaker, that the amendment does say and I will read it and I think it should be read:

This House declines to proceed with this Bill until the subject matter thereof . . .

And surely the interpretation of the word subject matter has to involve some reference at least to the amendments.

Mr. Romanow: — Mr. Speaker, on a point of order or point of clarification on your ruling. Am I not correct in interpreting the rules and your ruling in this fashion. That if I have not spoken on the main motion and I am speaking to the amendment, let me say for example, the amendment referring to a special committee, then I am given far wider latitude because the rules of this House have been that we treat the debates concurrently, both on the amendment and on the main motion? However, if I have spoken on the main motion and I now speak to the amendment then the rules are much more confining on me, because as your Honour has pointed out to the Members, Beauchesne says you cannot be allowed to enter into a debate twice and if you come in on the amendment and have the same latitude as if you had not spoken before then you are clearly breaking the rules of the House. And that is my point of order every time that I get up to the Member for Moosomin and the Member for Wilkie when he finished speaking, is that he is seeking to break out of the confines of the rules. That is too bad. Maybe he shouldn't have spoken on the main motion but he is now on the amendment and I come back to him, Mr. Speaker, on a point of order, they must stay within the rules of this House and within the rules of Parliament. He nods his head because he doesn't want to follow the rules of Parliament but he follows the rules of Parliament to the amendment and that is the merits of the special committee.

Some Hon. Members: — Hear, hear!

Mr. McIsaac: — Mr. Speaker, I again point out to the Attorney General the wording of the amendment. I ask the Attorney General to read the wording of the amendment.

Mr. Romanow: — It has nothing . . .

Mr. McIsaac: — It certainly does, it has everything to do with it, Mr. Speaker.

Mr. Smishek: — What is the Member talking about? He can't take part

in another debate. I would suggest the Member is out of order.

Mr. McIsaac: — I am not, Mr. Speaker. I am speaking to the point of order that the Member for Moosomin in making some reference to the amendments, which certainly do deal with the subject matter, is, therefore, not out of order and he is speaking within the confines and speaking on the amendment that is before us. It is as simple as that.

Mr. Speaker: — When we come to debating points of order, the Member can only rise once to debate the point of order which is before the House. I think I am allowing a lot of latitude because I realize what is in debate. But I realize that Members can discuss the subject matter of the Bill without quoting clauses and saying now where it should be amended or how this clause was affected by a Bill of the previous year. I would ask Members to stay within the guidelines that I am trying to lay down because I don't want to lay down a hard and fast rule which will hinder the debate rather than facilitate it.

Mr. Gardner: — Thank you, Mr. Speaker. I would be pleased to abide by your ruling and not by the ruling of the Attorney General who seems to feel that he can get up and make the rules for the House and tell us what we are supposed to do here just as it suits him. My interpretation, of course, is that we are discussing whether this should go to a committee. We have to give you some reasons why it should go to a committee. I have referred to a letter that the Minister of Agriculture (Mr. Messer) sent out to farmers in this province. We are speaking on their behalf. These people, by the hundreds, have indicated that they want this delayed and we are speaking on their behalf. That is the purpose of the opposition. They want it said and if I have to make a case at all to have this go to a committee, I have to indicate that these people believe that this Bill should be delayed and that it should go to a committee. I am trying to show that the farmers who have sent in these coupons, who have written to us, the farmers who have got the letter from the Minister, this is the reason why they want the Bill to go to a committee.

They received a letter, if the letter was not correct, if there is something in the letter that they are not happy about, then they want an opportunity to appear before a committee and say, look, here is a letter we got from the Minister of Agriculture, it says and it is underlined, "The commission has neither the power nor the desire to limit the production of any producer." Now if they want to debate that and question it they can do it before a committee. This is why we say we have to have this Bill go before a committee. This is what I am trying to do.

The Minister has said the commission doesn't have the power to control production. I am just saying that in the new section in this Bill that he has added the word "producing". It wasn't there before, never there before. He changed a complete section and you fellows at the back, I suggest you read it again. He has added — it said before, you license the people who are marketing — he has added the words "producing" or "marketing". So don't tell us that it has nothing to do with production, that the commission is not going

to control production in any way. Of course, they can control production. If they can issue you a licence to produce 40 cows, even to market 40 cows, they are, of course, limiting and controlling and affecting production. This is why I am even reluctant to pick this Bill up even though it is the Bill that we are supposed to be discussing as to why it should go to the committee. But it certainly has the word "producing" added and that is the only change in this particular section. He has put in "producing" or "marketing", so obviously the commission is going to control or have something to do with producing.

Also, farther down, he has made some changes that indicate that they can seize any of your cattle that you have, or particular product, and they can retain it or dispose of it. So I am indicating that this is the type of thing that the farmers are concerned about and this is the reason why we are trying to get this brought before a committee.

It is pretty obvious then, I think, that the Minister does have the power or is getting the power from the Act to also regulate and control production. And this is the key part of the whole Bill. This is what the Minister said he wasn't going to do. He's mentioned it several times. If he doesn't intend to do this why did he bring in an amendment in this particular Act which adds the word "producing"? This is all he does, bring in the word "producing". It is very obvious what he intends to do.

We have mentioned the need for a committee, Mr. Speaker. I would like to suggest that the farmers have been given a small bit of information by certain meetings that have been held around the country. They have been allotted a large amount of money by the Government to do this. But this information has been inadequate in spite of the fact that they were given \$400,000. The secretary of the commission, for example, said in the paper that it had received some indication of provincial assistance but did not expect so large a grant. Now this doesn't very often happen that anyone receives a grant and they find out it is much larger than they need but I suppose this money could have been used to further inform the farmers. And if it had been done we maybe now wouldn't have to be suggesting that this go before a committee. If they had used this money wisely perhaps it wouldn't be necessary at this time to be suggesting what we are doing with this motion.

I might mention that this \$400,000, Mr. Speaker, is actually the hog producers' money. It was budgeted a couple of years ago for them. It should have been sent out in cheques to the farmers, instead of that the NDP Government cancelled this program, cancelled this hog bonus, took their \$400,000 and handed it over to a Hog Commission to try and ram a program down the farmers' throats, something they didn't want. Not only are they ramming it down the throat of the farmer, they are using their \$400,000 to try and do it.

Mr. Speaker, I have referred before in this debate to the fact that we are trying to make a case for this going to committee. The Attorney General seems to be in some kind of hurry about the business of the House. Now if he is, I would be pleased to adjourn the debate and then we could get on with some other items in the House. But I should like to point out

to him that first reading of this Bill was given on the 6th of February and it sat on the Order Paper here until the first day of March. They got up several times and complained about the fact that it has been kicked around so long. Who was stalling it? They had all of this time and we are the ones now trying to make a case. They have allowed this to sit from February 6 to March 1. We are still within March and we are still trying to debate second reading to this. I think we are certainly entitled to discuss this as long as we like.

You may note in this regard also that we had other Acts — an Act to amend The Agriculture Implements Act which was introduced on the 5th of March and we still haven't had second reading. So my argument is that there shouldn't be any particular need for rushing if they are leaving these on the Order Paper and waiting for second reading. I have a speech on my desk that has been ready for three weeks.

Mr. Speaker: — I think the Hon. Member is straying a little bit.

Mr. Gardner: — Mr. Speaker, I will attempt to get back to the subject. I think you will agree that it is the duty of the Opposition to inform the public and if we feel that they are not informed to the extent that they should be it is our duty to see that this legislation is sent to a committee or keep it before the House in second reading until the farm people in the province have a chance to make known their views. And this, of course, is what we are doing.

I might say that I am not a hog producer and I won't pretend to be but I am a Member of the Legislature and I am speaking for thousands of farmers in this province. They elected me for that purpose and I feel that they want this sent before a committee and that is what I am here to do and I will do everything within my power to do it.

My colleague has indicated, Mr. Speaker, that a number of requests have come in from individuals who want a vote on the hog marketing Bill. And, of course, if they are going to have a vote it is going to mean that there has to be some delay. There have to be some changes in the Bill. The Bill would have to go to a committee. And if we are going to do what these people want us to do . . .

Mr. Robbins: — Mr. Speaker, on a point of order. I have been reading this amendment and I notice that it says, "that all the words after the word 'that' be deleted", and that deletes the words "No. 50", so how can they make reference to the Bill when it already deletes the words "Bill No. 50"? I just raise that point.

Mr. Speaker: — Order! I do not think that is a point of order.

Some Hon. Members: — Hear, hear!

Mr. Speaker: — Because this is an amendment, a proposed amendment which is not yet adopted by the House and therefore the subject matter of Bill No. 50 is before us along with this amendment which may

or may not be adopted by the House.

Mr. Gardner: — I would hope, Mr. Speaker, that some of the Members will be as anxious to get up and speak about this Bill as they are to make these points of order.

I was talking, Mr. Speaker, about the fact that the producers of the province want a vote. They have indicated in their hundreds that they want a vote. They have sent in coupons to that effect. If the Attorney General insists and he seems to be insisting, Mr. Speaker, we will have to indicate all of these to the House.

Mr. Romanow: — We've got all night. Go ahead.

Mr. Gardner: — All night would not be nearly enough. It would take a week. We are quite prepared for this. If the Attorney General is convinced that we do not have this information or they don't have it, we would be glad to put it on the record of the House and, of course, to do that we would have to indicate this to him by reading the name and the address of all of the people who have sent in these requests because this is the key point. This is why the motion is before us. It is because we are getting requests from these people. We could read the request and read what they want done on each one and have it on the record if the Attorney General really wants this done.

I should like to indicate, Mr. Speaker, that according to a report in the Leader-Post of January 26, "Messer Says No Dice To Hog Vote". This, of course, is a very crucial point. The farmers say they want a vote and Mr. Messer says 'no dice' to a vote. If the Member was misquoted he will have a chance to get up in the debate and indicate that he was misquoted but according to the press report, and that is all that I can go by, it indicates that Messer says, "No dice, no dice," to a hog vote by the farmer.

He said Friday as it indicates here, "that the province's new Hog Marketing Commission is being misrepresented among poorly informed producers." If they are poorly informed, I wonder whose fault it is. He has a budget and he has a good number of people available and if they are poorly informed probably he should be asking some of his people why this is so.

It says that he also rejected two resolutions passed by a meeting of the Saskatchewan Hog Producers' Association. He stated that the Commission was already in effect and that they were simply looking for a watered down version. Mr. Messer faced critics of the commission, formed in November, at the stormy Saskatoon meeting of 500 producers. How can you ignore, Mr. Speaker, the desires of 500 producers? 500 producers at that time wanted an opportunity to discuss this Bill further. They wanted, in effect, that it go to a committee and give them time to do something about it the same as the people who are sending in these coupons. But Messer says "no dice" according to this.

It says here also that after he left the meeting, the meeting passed two resolutions, one calling for a producer plebiscite before any hog marketing board or commission is

implemented. The second one called for legislation creating a producer elected hog organization financed by check-offs and having authority to deal with foreign companies and governments in exporting hogs.

Now this seems to be the wish of a very well attended hog marketing group who met in Saskatoon. It is difficult to see how the Minister ignores their desires at that time and it is difficult to see how he can ignore their wishes now by refusing to have this particular Bill referred to a committee.

It says in the article that there were 18,000 provincial farms in 1971 that had hogs and this is a very great number of people. I remind all rural Members of the Legislature that we have a duty to do what these people want. If the Minister has an indication or if any of the Members opposite have any information that indicates that the producers, a large number of these 18,000 producers, indeed don't want this sent to a committee, want this Bill as it is without a vote, want it without producers elected, want this reverse onus clause included in the Bill and the other undesirable parts in the Bill, if they have information to this effect that is what this debate is all about, Mr. Speaker. We are debating whether these people actually want a committee and if we should send this to a committee and give them an opportunity to speak. So if the Members have this information they have a duty to bring it forward. We should like to hear about it. If the Minister knows of some group or some organization and he has information, he has letters from them, if the Member over there have, that is the whole reason behind this debate and I hope that they will bring it out and let us see it.

I might also say that in this particular article in the paper, the Agriculture Minister said that the commission is expected to be in operation by April 1. Well, that is coming up fairly soon, Mr. Speaker. I sometimes wonder why the Minister would bring in a Bill and leave it sit on the Order Paper for so long without taking any action, without giving it second reading, if they felt there was some urgency for it. I might also indicate, again, from this article to show the desires of the actual producers. It says that at Saskatoon speaker after speaker criticized the Government's creation of a compulsory marketing commission without a plebiscite. This is an indication again of what speaker after speaker actually wanted, what the producers actually wanted and this is the reason that we are indicating today that we should like to see the Minister reconsider. We should like to see the Members opposite reconsider and have this sent to a committee and give these people a chance to appear before them. He said it would take a year or more to get a vote. We don't believe that this is true. We believe that it could be done very, very shortly.

The people who are opposed to this particular Bill, of course, are not only the hog producers. I refer to some information that has been in the paper, to the coupons, the articles and the letters that we have gotten from hog producers. But these are not the people who are chiefly concerned and this is not my chief concern. I am opposing this Bill not really because it might be detrimental at this time, but I am doing it because I feel that the other producers of natural products in this province would also like an opportunity to make their wishes known.

March 29, 1973

The cattle producers didn't know that they may be under the Act such as this and this is all the more reason for this going to a committee. They have found out in the last month or six weeks that they could wake up tomorrow morning and find out that the Minister has created a commission to control the marketing and production and so on of calves, that they would have to have a licence and all of these things would apply to them. This is the reason why they are concerned.

Certainly the Minister knows that meetings have been held around the province, well attended by all types of farmers, and in recent times especially by cattle producers. Cattle producers are the people who know that they are next, they are threatened. This is a sword hanging over their heads as well. They would like to have an opportunity to appear before a committee and say that they are not in favor of provisions such as we find in this particular Bill and this would be the only opportunity they would have to do it.

Now this is our reason, of course, for an amendment of this nature. We must speak now because there is no other time to speak. Once this Bill has gone through the House, a marketing commission can be set up for cattle at a moment's notice. These people could be under its control and would have no chance to say anything about it.

Certainly, Mr. Speaker, people such as myself who represent an area where there are a great number of cattle, are chiefly concerned. I might point out that some of the municipalities that I represent have the largest cattle population in Saskatchewan and this is why I am chiefly concerned. The Members know that the RM of Walpole, the RM of Wawken, the RM of Silverwood, have some of the largest cattle populations in the province. We usually think of the West as being cattle country, out of Swift Current or Maple Creek, but if you look at the figures you will find that per square mile that the largest number of cattle are in south eastern Saskatchewan and this is why I am concerned. I feel that I have to speak for these people and I don't think they want a marketing commission set up the way this one is being set up. And for this reason I would like the people to have a chance to do something about it.

Now we believe, of course, in the rights of these people to vote. It is strange, you know, that the NDP apparently don't believe in the right to vote and still they voted against an amendment that we proposed. They vote against the fact that we would like to have this done in a democratic manner and they are using a procedure here to deny people an opportunity to speak. They are using that procedure and they are denying that very procedure that these people want. All they are saying is that they want a vote. They send in this coupon indicating that they want a chance to vote and, of course, they want to appear before a committee and say that they want a chance to vote, and this is what they are being denied.

Now, Mr. Speaker, I have mentioned the fact that Mr. Messer has indicated that there would be no vote, "no dice for a vote". He indicated also that on April 1 this will come into effect and, of course, this is going to happen fairly soon if this actually does occur but we feel that these people should have a chance to speak.

There has been a steady erosion of the basic rights and

freedoms of the people in the Province of Saskatchewan, the farmers in the province, and this is a giant step along that particular line.

The powers in the Bill are what the farmers object to and this is why they want to appear before a committee. It would be no problem to have this Bill brought before a committee. This procedure has been done before. This Bill could even be withdrawn and reshaped. There is a precedent, of course, for that. Remember last year, The Foreign Ownership Bill, where the Minister, under severe pressure from the Opposition and from the people of the province, realized that the Bill, the same as this one was objectionable and particularly obnoxious to some people. He, at that time, withdrew the Bill. A committee looked at it during the summer months and, of course, everyone tried to sweep it under the rug and hoped that nobody would ever remember it again. The Foreign Ownership Bill, we haven't seen any legislation in that regard and we haven't heard anything more about it. I should like to see the same thing done with this.

An agriculture committee of some sort could take a look at this and this would be a chance to communicate directly with the people who are involved and we would hope that the Minister would give this some consideration.

Now in order to indicate further that the farmers of the province are concerned, I am sure that the Minister is aware of meetings that are held around the province. These meetings have been both large and small and they have been asking for exactly what we are asking for here. These meetings were mostly spontaneous. A group of farmers got together and decided to have a meeting and to object to this particular Bill that we are looking at today, to ask that it be postponed, to ask that they be given more time to take a look at it. These meetings have been very enthusiastic. Many people who have attended them have informed me that they went expecting to see 25 or 30 people but often they saw 2, 3 or 400 and this is an indication of the actual concern. I notice some of the Members in the back expressing a little concern now too because a lot of these meetings have been held in their constituencies. They know that there have been hundreds of farmers out to them. The meetings have been large and enthusiastic and I might say that this is a pretty direct opposite to the meetings that have been held by the people from the hog commission. Reports in the press and reports around the province indicate that the meetings that are held, which are supposed to inform the farmers, by these highly paid people that the Minister has been sending around get a very small crowd of 25 or 30 people. They don't really give them any information, they don't tell them what the commission is going to do, all they say is, oh, if you put in this commission it will increase the price, stabilize the price, help the markets, bunch of garbage of this nature, nothing specific. They don't say we are going to charge you so much, we are going to check off so much, we're going to do this or we are going to do that, they just give them some very vague information in the hope that they will be quiet and not do too much until this is actually a fact. But, of course, the people are concerned. I was on the hot line program on Tuesday morning of this week for two hours and I was amazed at the reception.

Mr. Messer: — You should be ashamed of your performance.

Mr. Gardner: — I'll tell you who should be ashamed of their performance, the two friends of the party opposite who continually phone in to these hot lines and I'm sure they don't even help the people who they think they are supposed to be helping because they make some very erratic statements and charges and I have found that the best thing to do is to just answer them in a statesman-like manner. It just shows up their behavior much better than if you try to answer them in the manner that they are doing.

Some Hon. Members: — Hear, hear!

Mr. Gardner: — So, with the exception of a couple of people such as this who certainly aren't farmers by any stretch of the imagination or have ever been or any connection with it, the people who phoned in did express their concern. They are very, very concerned and they want some time and they asked me what they could do in many cases. They said, "I'm only one person, what could I do to see that this Bill is stalled or that we could have some time on it?" And, of course, I had to tell them that it's a democratic country and that I hoped that the Government which is now in power in this particular country wouldn't push this through against their wishes, that they would get some opportunity to express their views or that it would, in effect, have this delayed, sent to a committee where these very people who took the time to phone, were anxious enough to phone, would have a chance to appear and make their views known. I am sure that there are many, many hundreds of them because the indication that I got from the phone calls was that they are not alone and they said that they would be doing all they could to see that this particular Bill was delayed.

Some Hon. Members: — Hear, hear!

Mr. Gardner: — Now, Mr. Speaker, I am sure that . . .

Mr. Feduniak: — Start over again.

Mr. Gardner: — . . . if some of the Members want to get up and speak, I will be sitting down very shortly. If some of the Members want to get up and speak I will be sitting down and we would welcome their comments on this. If they will just be patient for another minute or two they'll get their opportunity to get up and they won't have to be shouting across the floor.

It is an indication of the concern of the people in the province. I have an article from the Leader-Post of February 3, 1973, and it is headed, "Hog Raisers Protest Government Action". It says and I should like to quote from this because, again, it's a good reason why this particular Bill should be sent to a committee.

The Saskatchewan Hog Producers' Association demands that Agriculture Minister Messer immediately suspend the Saskatchewan Hog Marketing Commission pending a province-wide vote of all producers.

This is the Saskatchewan Hog Producers' Association. This is one of the groups that he referred to in his letter. He referred to here as:

The Government was asked by the Saskatchewan Hog Producers' Association.

Now does this sound like they were asking for this commission, Mr. Speaker? I doubt this very much because it says here very, very clearly that they demand that Agriculture Minister Messer immediately suspend the Saskatchewan Hog Marketing Commission pending a province-wide vote of all producers and it goes on and there are quotation marks around this next part:

We consider the Minister's attitude to be arrogant and ill-advised. We resent decisions as important as this being made without a plebiscite and we resent the Minister referring to us as ill-informed producers . . .

And, of course, he has done that in his letter and his statements.

. . . because we are defending our basic rights.

And this is by the president of the Saskatchewan Hog Producers' Association. It goes on to say:

We further ask the Federation of Agriculture and the Saskatchewan Wheat Pool to stop playing cheap politics with this issue. These organizations . . .

And this is going on from the article.

. . . favor compulsory marketing and strongly back a commission with no vote. Surely this must be the first time the staunch defenders of Saskatchewan agriculture have come to the defence of a Government which is afraid to take its policy to the people concerned, namely the hog producers.

And it goes on to say, and this is the important part again, Mr. Speaker, this is the point we are trying to make:

All producers, all hog producers who desire a vote must make their views known to the Government and to their elected Members.

Now I know that they are doing this as we are getting indications of this every day. We are getting the coupons in and we are getting letters and we are getting phone calls and I am sure that the Members opposite are and I know that they are trying to hide these. I understand some of them are throwing them in the waste basket but they are there and people are sending them in. I says here:

All hog producers who desire a vote must make their views known to the Government and to their elected Member. This must be done immediately as Mr. Messer has declared his intention to forge ahead regardless of producer opinion.

Now this is what these people seem to think and you have to agree, Mr. Speaker, that it's a pretty sad situation in the province if the people who are producing the hogs have this feeling. Whether they are right or wrong, something should be done to dispel the feelings that they have and they apparently feel, and it's quite clear in this article that Mr. Messer has declared his intention to forge ahead regardless of producer

opinion. So it's obvious, I think, that all Members of the House should support an amendment which would give these people a chance to indicate their opinion and if from that opinion, if they appeared before a board, appeared before a committee of this Legislature, and indicated that they wanted this put in without a vote then that would be a definite indication of what they want. We would have no option but to go along with it. We would be perfectly in favor of it if these people had a chance to say what they wanted done and to actually appear before a committee and indicate their position. For example, we have an article from the Leader-Post of March 3, 1973 and this has to do with the . . .

Mr. Speaker: — Order, order! Just a moment, I would like to read, I have been very patient and I would like to read from Beauchesne under Rules of Debate on page 133, section 157, sub-paragraph (5):

It is not in order to read articles in newspapers, letters or communications emanating from persons outside of the House and referring to, or commenting on, or denying anything said by a Member, or expressing any opinion reflecting on proceedings within the House.

Mr. Gardner: — Well, Mr. Speaker, I won't quote from an article if this is your ruling but certainly I am sure that you will recall that Members on both sides of the House, almost daily, quote from articles in the newspaper. However, I should like to indicate to you that I recently read an article in the paper which indicated that a meeting held at Lampman, Saskatchewan, which is down in the south eastern part of the province, and that several hundred farmers appeared at this meeting. The meeting was called to discuss Bill 50, the Bill that we are looking at here tonight and these people were almost unanimous in their desire to have this Bill deferred and it is certainly another indication of the fact that a large number of producers in the province would like to have an opportunity to appear before a committee and to see if something could be done to have their desires made known. Of course, what they basically want at Lampman, as well as many other places, is an opportunity to discuss with a committee of the Legislature all of the aspects of Bill 50, to look at the contents of the Bill and hopefully to have some changes made in it or at least have a vote.

There apparently was a meeting also at Shellbrook. I won't quote from the article if this is your ruling, Mr. Speaker, but a meeting was held at Shellbrook recently also and it was put on by the marketing commission itself. They didn't get several hundred people, they didn't even get 100 people. They got, according to the article, about 35 people out and from the report it would indicate that they are not satisfied with the information they were given. They had people come out from Regina who just indicated to them that a marketing commission was going to be set up. According to these people who held the meeting, it would be good for them, they were going to have it whether they wanted it or not and this was what would be done. So I am just giving you an indication, Mr. Speaker, that

high-priced people from the department with a lot of publicity, big notices in the paper, lots of fanfare, can go out and try to promote a meeting to inform the farmers, supposedly inform the farmers from the Hog Marketing Commission itself, people just don't show up, they are not interested. A group of farmers who don't have these resources, don't have the experts that are available from the Department of Agriculture can just get together and spontaneously call a meeting and get hundreds of people out to indicate that they are against the way the Minister is going about this and to indicate that they would like a chance to have it looked at a little further.

I would hope that the Minister would pay some attention to what these people are doing and to the fact they are getting together, holding meetings of their own, they are contributing their own time and money, they don't have the \$400,000 from the Department of Agriculture like the Hog Commission has to promote these meetings, to hire a lot of high-priced organizers to go out and ram this down the throats of their neighbors. All they have is their own resources. They get together, a few of them hire a hall, spread the word amongst their neighbors and hundreds of them come out and indicate that they would like some delay in this. They are not happy with the way it is being done and certainly, Mr. Speaker, I fail to understand how the Minister can ignore what these people are doing. These people are trying to participate in our democratic way of life. They are doing the best they can and it is being completely ignored by the NDP Government.

The Government Members don't pay any attention to them, the Minister pays no attention to them. They are trying to organize these meetings to get something done and, of course, they are being completely ignored. I've contrasted this to the other type of promotion that the Minister, his well-financed slick outfit has in trying to push this plan around the province and they are not having any success. So it should be an indication that the Minister is listening to the wrong people. If he has advice that indicates that someone is actually in favor of this type of thing, then this is bad advice that he is being given and we would hope that he would listen to the Members of the Opposition, that he would listen to the farmers around the province, and that he would get up as he did last year and say, look, I made a mistake, I don't want this Bill to go through. I would hope that he is big enough to admit that he has made a mistake and say, look, I will withdraw the Bill, I'll put it before a committee, we'll give the people of the province a chance to say what they would like done. If they made their desires known then this is a democracy and we'll do what they indicate.

So, Mr. Speaker, I am sure that there are many other people on both sides of the House who would like to speak in this debate and I will say at this time that I will be supporting the amendment that is proposed.

Some Hon. Members: — Hear, hear!

Mr. D. Boldt: — (Rosthern) Mr. Speaker, I realize that for the last two hours we have been fighting more or less whether the Members who spoke were in order nor not. The Attorney General had a lot of difficulty find out whether there were in order and tried to have our Members not speak.

I should like to refer you, Mr. Speaker, to the flag debate of about seven or eight years ago in the House of Commons when Mr. Pearson introduced a Bill to establish the national flag of Canada. It was reported that the debate carried on in the House for 70 days and amendment after amendment was moved and I'm certain that the Opposition at that time always spoke about the one item. This is the purpose of amendments, to give Members the opportunity to speak for the second time, perhaps not repeat what they have said but certainly repeat the principle of the Bill. And as this amendment speaks out that the subject matter thereof, I want or at last I would like to be considered to be in order. I will try to stay within the resolution, within the amendment and I hope that the Minister will take some care in the few words that I have to say.

I really believe that an issue such as this justifies public hearings. The reason I say this is the fact that today the Minister of Agriculture is sending out public servants and they are busy engaged in informing the hog producers of these amendments. Either these civil servants have not been told the truth or they have been told to tell the farmers untruths or the Minister doesn't know what the Bill is about. They have tried to misinform the hog producer or the department does not intend to do what the Bill tells this House what the commission will do.

For example, at the Laird meeting, which happens to be in my constituency, one of the two gentlemen at the meeting from the department, either Mr. Miller, the agricultural representative from the Rosthern area or Mr. Elder were questioned about the licensing of hog producers. The hog producers at this meeting were told that they would not be called upon to be licensed nor would there be a fee. Well, somebody is not telling the truth because the Bill that is before us says very, very, plainly, Mr. Speaker, that hog producers will be licensed. It doesn't say that there will be a fee for it but they certainly will be licensed.

This is what concerns the hog producer. When I heard of the meeting in Laird I sent a few copies of the Bill to the hog producers in the area. According to my information from the farmers at the meeting, and I could be corrected because I am taking their word for it, this question was asked and quoted directly from the Bill. Apparently these two civil servants didn't even have a Bill with them. Either these two civil servants haven't read the Bill or the Government, as I said, doesn't intend to do what the Bill states to us in the House it proposes to do and has the power to do. The question in the minds of farmers now is: Will the Department of Agriculture through the hog commission license every hog producer or just the large producers or none at all? The next question is whether the commission will tell the hog producer where he will be asked to sell his hogs. This question was asked of these two gentlemen and they said very plainly that the farmer will not be told where he is supposed to market his hogs. Yet the Bill very specifically tells us that this commission has the power to tell the farmers where and when. Now will it be Intercontinental Packers or will the producer have a choice? This is what the farmers would like to know.

Another question asked is: Will the farmer be told on what day of the week or month he can shop his hogs? Will he be able to use his own truck or will the commission pick them up for them?

Again, they were told that you can do what you want. But the Bill specifically tells us that these hogs can either be picked up by a commercial enterprise or the farmer might be able to truck his hogs in with his own truck.

I want to tell the Members of this House and I need not tell this to the farmer that the marketing and raising of hogs is almost an exact science. They have a certain weight so they must be shipped on the day that they are ready. A week or two early or late could mean substantial loss to the farmer.

The coupons sent to me which were previously referred to in this debate as they appeared in the Western Producer were not solicited by me. I have received 26 in total from hog producers. I believe there is one that does not come from the Rosthern area, it comes from Prudhomme which is bordering my constituency. I do not know their political philosophy and I don't care, but all 26 — this I know — have come out against the setting up of a hog commission without the vote and without the producer control.

I think the Minister of Agriculture must begin to realize that farmers are not exactly stupid. Farmers might need more time to think out some of the concerns and problems facing them but surely most farmers are extremely intelligent and very capable of forming good judgements. I am convinced by the attitude of the Hon. Minister and the Government Members opposite that they are determined to pass this Bill regardless of how long he would like it to be debated. If there was a crisis in the hog industry, I could sympathize with them. Now for the first time in decades the hog producer is getting a better price, he is getting a price which is related to the cost of production. It will be hard to convince anybody, the farmer in particular, that now is the time to introduce the commission or a board.

The Minister has stated that it would take about a year before a plebiscite could be taken. I think he should take a leaf out of Otto Lang and the Wheat Board's procedure. Otto Lang wanted to know whether the farmers wanted to have the two-price system based on wheat, on acreage, or both. It was just a matter of days or I would say a couple of weeks when all producers received a ballot so to say and they could mark it and the letter would go in the mail without a stamp. I would imagine that most farmers sent theirs in within seven to ten days. I am sure that within less than a month Otto Lang knew exactly what the farmers wanted, whether they want a two-price system based on acreage or on acreage and wheat.

The Attorney General is anxious to go forward with business in the House, some members are extremely restless today so, therefore, Mr. Speaker, there are other Members in this House that want to take part. I am sure they want to think about some things that we have said and I beg leave to adjourn this debate.

Mr. Speaker: — This debate is running concurrently with the debate that was on before. The Hon. Member already had an adjournment and he cannot adjourn the debate again because he would be adjourning both debates. I think the Hon. Member has lost his right to speak because he voluntarily took his seat.

Mr. MacLeod: — Mr. Speaker, I don't understand your ruling. If

a person applied for leave to adjourn a debate must he remain standing?

Mr. Speaker: — The Hon. Member concluded his speech, then he asked leave to adjourn the debate. Our rules are quite plain, a person can have one adjournment and one adjournment only. The Hon. Member . . . will the Hon. Member be seated while I am speaking or else state your point first . . . our rules that were revised in 1970 made it quite plain. Prior to that if a Member asked leave to adjourn the debate and the House denied him that right, he was through. But we amended the rules in 1970 so that a Member can have one adjournment, when he comes back in, he can speak again and move an amendment. Now the Hon. Member for Rosthern on March 12 adjourned the debate. He had his adjournment. He came back in now and is speaking on the motion which is running concurrently with the motion on the Bill and he cannot have a second adjournment. Therefore, he has lost his right to speak because he concluded his speech for this time and asked for leave to adjourn and sat down. It was nothing that the Chair did, it was the Member himself.

Mr. Boldt: — How do you know I had concluded my speech?

Mr. Speaker: — Because the Hon. member took his seat before the Speaker rose.

Mr. Boldt: — You said I had concluded my speech. You don't know whether I have got three or four . . .

Mr. Speaker: — I am sorry. I was caught under that trap myself at times so I know how you feel.

Mr. McIsaac: — Mr. Speaker, on the point of order. Are you saying, is it correct, Sir, what precedents do we have for the fact? The Hon. Member put a motion to adjourn which is out of order, as such, for the reason you have given. I don't question that, Mr. Speaker. Surely then he can carry on his remarks. He had to take his seat while you considered the motion, Sir, surely he can get up and continue his remarks.

Mr. Speaker: — The debate that is before us is a concurrent debate. It is on both Bill No. 50 and the amendment. On Bill 50 the Hon. Member had an adjournment. So at this time when he is asking leave to adjourn now, he is not only asking leave to adjourn the amendment but he is asking leave to adjourn the Bill. He has had the one adjournment and cannot have a second one. The Member who spoke asked leave to adjourn and took his seat before the Speaker rose. Therefore, he has exercised his right on this occasion.

Mr. McIsaac: — The only point, Mr. Speaker, certainly when he put the adjournment motion he would have to take his seat to give you the opportunity to consider that motion. Are you saying that by virtue of the Member taking his seat to give the Chair time to consider the motion, that action in itself cut him off from

the right to continue speaking?

Mr. Boldt: — Mr. Speaker, I accept your ruling.

Mr. Speaker: — Our recommendation in our report “An Adjournment of a Debate”, a recommendation that a Member who lost a motion for the adjournment of debate shall not thereby be precluded from continuing the debate provided he does so forthwith. Now the Member can only have one adjournment but he had an adjournment on March 12. But the subamendment gives him a right to enter the debate again but it doesn’t give him a right for adjournment.

Mr. McIsaac: — How does that take away the right of the Member to continue his remarks, the adjournment motion having been properly declared out of order? Would not then the Member for Rosthern be able to continue his remarks?

Mr. Speaker: — I would say not because the Hon. Member asked leave to adjourn and sat down. He had concluded his remarks for this time so he signified to the House. Therefore, other Members have a right to speak. Had he not had the adjournment on March 12 he would have been in order to ask for adjournment, if he was denied, then he would be able to continue. He had the one adjournment. It is the same reasoning that the Member cannot speak to the same debate twice.

Mr. McIsaac: — I follow that, Mr. Speaker, but again he made the point that he had other points he was going to make and he asked to adjourn and the adjournment motion was out of order. Naturally he was refused. Surely, Mr. Speaker, the mere fact he sought to adjourn would indicate he had more to say, that he wasn’t finished his remarks, this is my point.

Mr. Speaker: — The Hon. Member wasn’t refused adjournment by the House, he was refused by the rules. Therefore, it was finished because he was refused by the rules of the House.

Mr. MacLeod: — May I ask you one question? If I may have a moment from the crowd, Mr. Speaker. To maintain his right to continue speaking, because he doesn’t know, nor does any Member know for sure that his motion is in order, if he made a motion for leave to adjourn the debate, is the way to maintain his right to speak that he should stay on his feet? That is, should he remain standing, uncovered as the rules say, while he finds out if he is in order? For example, if he had stayed standing while you made your ruling, would that have kept his place?

Mr. Speaker: — The Members should check the rules first and not after. I have ruled that the Member has exercised his right and we shall proceed or take a vote because I can’t permit a debate this way on the rules.

Mr. T. M. Weatherald: — (Cannington) Mr. Speaker, you are noted for your fair-mindedness and I must say that I agree with you on this occasion.

Some Hon. Members: — Hear, hear!

Mr. Weatherald: — In any event, Mr. Speaker, I do have a few remarks to relate to this amendment that we have moved. I think that it is an extremely important amendment that we have moved. I think that it is an extremely important amendment and I want to relate some of the reasons why I think the Government should be giving it a little more consideration than they are.

The Attorney General early in the evening suggested that it was taking too much time. I would only suggest, Mr. Speaker, we have given many opportunities for him to adjourn this debate and move to other business. Really, if he is anxious to get the work of the House done we really did not have to discuss this particular Bill for two or three weeks and could have been conducting other business and not using the time of the House if he thinks it is a waste of time.

Mr. Speaker, this brings me to the point that I think is important. Why is it that the Government is so anxious to pass this Bill so quickly? I see no other Bill . . .

Mr. Speaker: — I wish the Attorney General and the Minister of Agriculture would refrain from interrupting.

Some Hon. Members: — Hear, hear!

Mr. Weatherald: — I agree, Mr. Speaker. Mr. Speaker, we have had a number of other Bills on the Order Paper for some length of time and I have seen no great desire for the Government to pass these Bills in such rapid fire manner.

I, too, have had a number of people in my constituency write in about this matter and wanting a vote and wanting an opportunity to appear before the committee. I might say that I can only recognize, out of the 35 odd certificates that I have received, about seven or eight people who are actually Liberal supporters. I did receive three out of the 35 that supported the Government going ahead and passing it without a vote. Those three were NDP supporters and it is well known that they were at the time. I respect their right to that opinion but apparently they didn't get too much support from the general population of the constituency.

I want to say why I really think the Government is missing a grand opportunity to show their faith in farmers in Saskatchewan by taking this to a committee. I have very good reason to believe that the Minister of Agriculture has a plan ready for operation now. I think that it is fairly well taken that the plan that will be coming into operation is well known by the Government Members. I am extremely disappointed that he hasn't stood up in the Assembly and given some of the information of this plan. One of the great things that we could do, if we had this committee, we could have the Minister appear before the committee and outline the plan and answer questions, give information to hog producers why this would be a good plan. Once they have been convinced it would be a good plan, I don't think there would be any problem in taking a plebiscite of hog producers in the province. My understanding is that there are about 18,000 hog producers in Saskatchewan. Certainly they are well registered throughout different packing houses, having

made sales to them in the last while. Their names would be readily available and the information could be sent to them, a few meetings conducted. As I said one of the prime things that could be done very quickly with the committee, Mr. Speaker, is the Minister could outline his plan. I am sure that he has a plan. He has announced at various time he is going to have it in operation by April 1. There has really been no reason why they wouldn't go ahead and develop this plan and have it available by April 1. There is really no reason why he couldn't tell us at that committee meeting how this is going to work and various interested persons could ask a few questions. I think the Government has the information of the plan but they are waiting until they can pass this Bill before they will let it be known. Now I think there are some pretty good questions that could be asked at this meeting. I just picked up, Mr. Speaker, in the March 22 edition of the Winnipeg Tribune, that the hog board which was implemented in Manitoba without a vote 15 months ago has made a contract, which the Minister of Agriculture announced at the New Democratic Party convention, a contract with Japan for the sale of pork. Mr. Uskiw, the Minister of Agriculture in Manitoba made this announcement. But the very peculiar thing about this announcement is that nobody yet has found out at what price it was sold for, Mr. Speaker.

Mr. Messer: — I can tell you.

Mr. Weatherald: — Well, apparently Mr. Uskiw hasn't told anybody else. Now if you would like to disclose that for all of Manitoba we would be delighted to have it. Mr. Speaker, in the Legislature it was asked of the Minister of Agriculture to divulge the information as to what was paid for pork. And again, this is the kind of question that should be answered in a committee. The producers in Manitoba have been denied any information whatsoever by the hog board there, which is not producer controlled, as to what the price of pork was to Japan some months ago last December.

Of course, producers are getting pretty alarmed in Manitoba, Mr. Speaker, because the word that is being passed around by various sources of information is that the price was really 36 cents a pound. We know that hogs are selling for over 50 cents a pound. Of course, the Government there isn't too anxious to tell the farmers if they sold those hogs for 36 cents and that they are really losing about 14 or 15 cents a pound on the sale that they made.

Again, this certainly points out the reason why the Opposition here has been requesting that we have a producer controlled board and that it only be implemented with a vote. In Manitoba we have a board that is not controlled by the producers and it was not voted in by producers, they were not given a chance to vote.

Mr. Speaker: — I think the Hon. Member for Cannington spoke on this debate but adjourned. He has the right to enter the main debate again as well as the motion because he did not pick up his adjournment when he was called. So he has latitude to discuss a greater principle of the Bill than those who spoke and exercised their right on Bill No. 50.

Mr. Weatherald: — Thank you, Mr. Speaker, you are quite right on that. I did adjourn it and I didn't use my opportunity to speak again at that particular time.

Mr. Speaker, in this article it said the hog marketing board was imposed 15 months ago. Six of its eight members were appointed and not elected by the producers. "This provisional board is dragging its feet," this news article says. And it also goes on to say that the announcement was made at the NDP convention in December and Mr. Uskiw has not given any details of the price the pork was sold to the Japanese. The amount of the sale was approximately \$1.5 million and, of course, the question is now for what price was this pork sold.

I think this pretty adequately illustrates, Mr. Speaker, one of the great faults of a government run board. The producers in Manitoba have had one for 15 months. It is run by the Government. It's the same kind of a board that the Government here wants. The people in Manitoba can't find out at what price the pork was sold. They don't know whether they are losing money on it or if they are going to make money on it. They are pretty suspicious today that they are losing money on it and because it is government controlled by a government commission no one in the business has been able to get the information that they had hoped for and therefore they are unable to plan their business in the manner in which they would like to.

That is what has happened with a commission in Manitoba and I am fearful that type of thing could happen here in Saskatchewan unless it is voted in by producers and controlled by the producers so they know precisely and exactly what is going on and they don't have to rely on any government to give them that information if the government wishes to.

The Minister talks about some meetings that he held. I have picked up some of the concern expressed at these meetings. Let's take, for example, the one held at Tisdale by the Minister and it says:

Probably one of the liveliest meetings of the series took place in Melfort on February 17 when more than 200 turned out for a confrontation with Agriculture Minister Messer.

Now that doesn't sound like too happy a meeting, Mr. Speaker. It goes on to say.

This was a repeat of the battle at Saskatoon during the livestock convention in January in which stock growers voiced opposition to the whole idea of a government appointed hog commission.

The press release, Mr. Speaker, goes on to say:

Mr. Althouse speaking said that the next step for the commission would be to negotiate a price formula with the packers. There have been some preliminary approaches in this area. The Commission will allocate hogs to plants according to need and avoid having a problem with supply.

Mr. Speaker, of course, to a producer of hogs to suggest, by as high an official as this, to suggest that they will be having

some say in the allocation of hogs to packing houses must certainly bring out great concern.

I have a number of hog producers in my area and they, of course, are greatly concerned with this allocation of hogs because they know that if hogs are not going to the plants that are closest to them and most efficient operations, that this is going to cost them more money in freight. Again, this is the kind of question that the Government should be answering because the Government can stand up, Mr. Speaker, and tell us how great it is to be able to process more meat products in Saskatchewan and we may well agree with them but we shouldn't be forcing the producer in the eastern corner of the province to ship hogs to Saskatoon when the finished meat is going to be consumed in Montreal or Toronto. That is not economic efficiency.

Many producers are extremely concerned that they are going to get stuck for the extra freight in order to maintain jobs in the Province of Saskatchewan. And, again, this is the kind of question that the Government should be answering for the producers because they are legitimate questions and they should be answered.

Just a few days ago a producer was up here to the Session. He raised 1,200 hogs and that is his sole agricultural operation. I can tell you, Mr. Speaker, that he is quite convinced that he is capable of making a decision on whether a hog marketing commission is good for him or not. As a matter of fact, the same individual did not really indicate whether he really wanted one or he didn't want one. But he was very violent in his objection to the Government coming along and putting one in without giving him the chance to voice his opinion.

Now, Mr. Speaker, again, I go on to another quote from this article:

Questioned about whether the commission would set production quotas, Mr. Althouse replied that the commission did not plan to do so.

Now this, of course, Mr. Speaker, is very, very confusing I think to most readers because we have been told in this Assembly by the Minister that the commission couldn't do so. Mr. Althouse says at a meeting of 200 people, at which the Minister was present, that they don't plan to do so. Now, Mr. Speaker, how can they plan to do it if it is legally impossible?

Mr. Messer: — A misquote.

Mr. Weatherald: — The Minister always goes back to a misquote. Well, he should have corrected it as it was at the meeting. All he has to do is stand up and say, well, we can't do it, it is legally impossible to do it.

Mr. Messer: — I did!

Mr. Weatherald: — I doubt if you did. I don't think that if he stood up and said that it was legally impossible to do so that the writer would have been that bad that he would still have misquoted him. I think that he had the opportunity to do so and

he didn't do so. He had a good chance to do so. He didn't take the opportunity before 200 people at this meeting to stand up and say it was legally impossible so it shouldn't be discussed. That is what he tells us. But, of course, Mr. Speaker, we are not too inclined to believe what he says because many of my colleagues have outlined that the power is in the Act, although by devious methods, but methods nevertheless which could be employed.

He went on to say:

Mr. Althouse said that if it appeared a hog surplus was in sight the commission would seek additional markets for hogs at home and abroad.

But, again, Mr. Speaker, I refer back. He didn't say outright at that meeting before 200 people that it was impossible for the Government to employ a production quota, he said that they were simply not anticipating to do so.

An Hon. Member: — Did somebody ask him?

Mr. Weatherald: — Well, I think somebody must have asked him or he would not have given that type of answer. I think that if I had been the Minister at that meeting I would have made it pretty clear that's what it was.

Some Hon. Members: — Hear, hear!

Mr. Weatherald: — I don't think I would have left that open to judging.

An Hon. Member: — What are you quoting?

Mr. Weatherald: — I am quoting a news release for the Western Producer in Saskatchewan. I am quoting the person who was representing the commission at that meeting. I might also say, Mr. Speaker, that the Minister was there and if there was a misquote I think that he is as much responsible for it as anybody.

So, Mr. Speaker, we have now also the connection of the Government buying Intercontinental Packers. Certainly, when one looks at the buying of this packing house we find that the return on the investment by the Government would be about three per cent and considering, Mr. Speaker, that the Government is probably paying eight per cent to borrow this money, the taxpayers are subsidizing the \$10.2 million investment to the tune of about five per cent per year. Which makes a person conclude, Mr. Speaker, that there has to be another reason why the Government bought Intercontinental Packers. There has to be another reason why the Government bought Intercontinental Packers because we are going to lose about five per cent interest per year on the \$10.2 million investment or around, I would think about half a million per year that the taxpayers will be subsidizing.

Obviously, the Government has, therefore, bought this for other reasons and those other reasons it has not, in any flight of imagination, attempted to explain to us. We can only conclude that one of the prime reasons is interlocked with the Hog Marketing Commission. I can express that there is a great deal

of producer concern in this regard.

I might say, as my colleague from Moosomin (Mr. Gardner) adequately put forward, that we are tremendously disappointed that we have had so little participation from Members such as from Maple Creek (Mr. Flasch), Gravelbourg (Mr. Gross), Notukeu-Willow Bunch (Mr. Engel), Shaunavon (Mr. Oliver), Kelvington (Mr. Byers), all of those good cattle areas who have not expressed their desire for this Bill. Certainly the Government has not passed on their logic as to why they feel this is a good move, Mr. Speaker, without a vote and without producer consultation. I think that maybe some of them have already gotten the message from their areas.

I think that this will create a very, very bad precedent. For the first time in Saskatchewan, as my colleagues have outlined, Mr. Speaker, we will be having a board or commission set up which is really similar to a board except being government controlled with all encompassing powers and without the producers having the final say or having an opportunity to voice any questions or objections. That, to my way of thinking, Mr. Speaker, is an extremely bad precedent. It is a precedent which should not go unnoticed by producers and I am sure that it is not going unnoticed by producers.

The Liberal Government previously set up three boards and as has been mentioned before, these three boards set up with 65 per cent of votes required to be able to put the board into operation, for eggs, chickens and turkeys. I think at that time that it was a good move and I would certainly support the Government if they require 65 per cent of the hog producers' vote. If the producers indicate that they wish a board I would be more than delighted to see them go ahead and have one.

Some Hon. Members: — Hear, hear!

Mr. Weatherald: — I should also like to say that we have no quarrel whatsoever with the board if the people themselves wish to have one.

However, I do think that there is considerable quarrel with the present approach and there should be considerable quarrel with the Government that apparently has decided what is good for everyone all on their own. They have the power, the people behind them, the money, all of the talent available that money can buy to go out and explain these matters, to answer questions and so forth but they have completely and totally chosen to disregard using these facilities. I think that has to be extremely disappointing to the farmers throughout the province. I think that the farmers are disappointed in this Government because I can indicate to you, Mr. Speaker, that farmers were getting a little bit perturbed with people that always say they know what is good for them.

I think that when you get down to such fundamental decisions as this, that the man who does the work himself can make that type of decision as to what is in his own best interest.

It is interesting to note that the Minister told us how he once had the support of the hog producers. And then he said, well, the hog producers changed their mind. At one time they supported us. My understanding of the hog producers, according

to a press release is that about 200 people belong to the hog producers out of about 18,000 producers in the province. This is approximately 200 producers out of 18,000 in the province. Out of this 200 at the meeting where the decision was made that they would support a commission, the original decision, there were only about 40 people there. And it goes on to record at that meeting that out of the 40 people that were there, there was considerable opposition, however, it did pass by a small margin. So probably, Mr. Speaker, you could say that out of 40 people at this meeting, the original decision there was made by maybe 22 or 23 people in favor and 16 or 17 against. When you consider the 22 or 23 people who originally thought that it was a valid enough reason, it is not too surprising that when they consider that they are representing 18,000 people that they reconsidered and decided that they should give 18,000 a chance to make the decision rather than just 22 or 23. I think this was a fair enough and valid reason for the Hog Producers' Association to decide really that they should give every producer his own right and chance to register his approval or disapproval.

Mr. Speaker, just in conclusion I want to say that this would be an admirable opportunity if we go into committee to have the Minister of Agriculture appear before that committee because I am totally convinced that the Minister of Agriculture has a plan in his back pocket as of now. I think that the only reason that he wants to pass this legislation in a hurry and rush it through so that he doesn't have to answer any more questions in this Legislature but he can announce somewhere outside the Legislature. So I think that if we had this committee we could certainly have producers come and ask questions and let the Minister explain. I am sure that he could come up with a much better plan that he probably has. His commission members, as my colleague says, could appear and explain. There would be a great amount of publicity of how it is going to work. I suggest to the Minister that he would come up probably with a much better plan and he will get better support in the long run. I think everybody would be much better off than what they are going to be under these circumstances here. I think he would also allay a lot of concern about the Government's intentions for the future if he did this as well. He maybe could get back on the tracks so that the farmers had a little bit more confidence in what the Government was doing.

So all in all, Mr. Speaker, I have not heard any valid reasons whatsoever from the Government opposite for not going to the committee and explaining it and having a vote. Mr. Speaker, I wholeheartedly support the amendment.

Some Hon. Members: — Hear, hear!

Mr. J. G. Lane: — (Lumsden) Mr. Speaker, I hadn't really intended to join in this filibuster but it is with a great deal of pleasure that I do. I will tell you why, Mr. Speaker, because the Minister of Agriculture has told the public of Saskatchewan that farm organizations and all the farmers and all the people support the idea of a compulsory marketing board and a compulsory hog marketing commission. And yet one group has had the courage to stand up and say that is not true, that what the Minister says

is not true. And those are the very people who are concerned with the hog marketing commission and that is the hog producers themselves.

Mr. Speaker, we are giving the Minister of Agriculture a chance to rectify one of the biggest mistakes in his short political career, by sending this to committee.

I am going, Mr. Speaker, to take a fair amount of time to show the Members opposite the value of the committee system and the reasons for the committee system, the desire for a committee system and the advantages of a committee system.

We make absolutely no apologies to anyone, Mr. Speaker. We call this a filibuster. It is a filibuster by the Opposition and we are proud of the fact because the producers themselves don't want a marketing commission without a vote. And the Government opposite refuses to give them a vote.

We have heard again from one of the back benchers over there that they don't want a vote. It is the typical myopic approach of the Government opposite where they don't want to look beyond the end of their noses and just see what the people do want because the farmers and the hog producers want a vote. And it is the position of our party that the farmer, if he wants to give up all these rights and the right to make a decision as to how he wants to farm, then he should do it by a rational decision having all valuable information. A committee would only serve to aid to give that information to the farmers. That is all the more reason for having a committee. It will give free debate and free discussion and a free flow of information between those who are proposing the committee and those who admittedly are not sure whether or not they want a commission. But they do know of the Minister of Agriculture's deceptive approach in the past. His deception in giving reasons for a Bill, his deception in advising the people that the farmers and the hog producers warrant this type of legislation. It is a chance to clear the air.

Let's look at some of the reasons for a committee. We had a situation a year ago when there was a great deal of panic in the Government opposite. They made their first tremendous political blunder when they brought in The Foreign Ownership Bill.

We are debating the amendment that the House decline to proceed with this Bill until the matter has been investigated by a special select committee of this Legislature. I am sure it will give weight to my argument for the Members opposite to hear one of their front benchers, one of the Treasury Benchers, when that political blunder was made last year when the Minister of Agriculture tried to fall over backwards to withdraw the iniquitous Foreign Ownership Bill and had to be bailed out by the Attorney General (Mr. Romanow).

Mr. Snyder: — Good idea.

Mr. Lane: — Yes, it was a good idea to pull that Bill out. It was a good idea to bail out the Minister of Agriculture. I am glad that the Minister of Labour (Mr. Snyder) agrees with me. Let us look at some of the reasons that the Attorney General gave when he talked about putting that to a committee because these

reasons are vital. I am quoting the Attorney General:

And here is the Bill as a source of discussion. Now the Member from Wilkie seems to suggest that there is something wrong or there is something improper for a Member of the Government or any person of the Legislative Assembly to get up and say, here is a Bill, we are telling the people of Saskatchewan that we are going to be having that Bill the subject matter of a debate later on in a special committee.

And these are the reasons for sending it to a committee.

We could do it by resolution . . .

Said the Attorney General.

The Member for Wilkie is one hundred per cent right but let not the Member for Wilkie say that we could not do it the way that we did it because we can do it the same way and the Member from Wilkie acknowledges that.

And that is at page 2,055 of the Votes and Proceedings dated April 27, 1972. Again, just for the Members opposite because they are wont to forget who said these things unless it fits their political means. These are the reasons of the Attorney General for putting The Foreign Ownership Bill in committee.

If the Member is sincere . . .

These, again, are quite apt words.

. . . and he acknowledges that we could do it that way and as some Members of his party say that they are genuinely concerned about this matter of foreign ownership then he would lend his support to the Minister of Agriculture and the Members on this side to have this Bill and all other related matters around the topic thoroughly canvassed and discussed in Saskatchewan rather than making a political football out of the issue.

Now those are very grand words from the Attorney General. I am going to turn them around. If the Hon. Minister of Agriculture is sincere and is genuinely concerned about this matter of marketing boards then he would lend his support to the Member from Wilkie and the Members on this side to have this Bill and all other related matters around the topic thoroughly canvassed and discussed in Saskatchewan rather than making a political football out of the issue.

Now the Hon. Attorney General, and this is certainly a classic when one is trying to argue for sending particular matters to committee, and what does the Attorney General say next as the Members opposite seem to want to forget the words of the Attorney General?

And I said this in my opening remarks about the Member for Wilkie because I meant it and I know from our caucus our people feel the same way. I say that I am disappointed in what he said because the Member from Cannington (Mr. Weatherald) has gotten up now on a least two or three occasions that I know of in this House, in fact, I think even once before the Orders of

Day urging the Government to take this topic into hand and to work to some resolution of it. I always assumed . . .

Said the Attorney General.

. . . although I may have been 100 per cent in error, that either the Member for Cannington or the Member for Moosomin (Mr. Gardner) and certainly I'll say the Member from Cannington is the agricultural spokesman for the Liberal Opposition.

Obviously a bad job of correcting here, Mr. Attorney General.

I assumed that what he said was, in effect, the voice of the Liberal caucus and the Government assumed that,

Mr. Speaker: — Is the Member discussing Bill 50? I don't think you are on the topic that is before us, Bill 50 and its amendment.

Mr. Lane: — Mr. Speaker, the amendment, I believe, and I think we have been through this, is that the subject go to a committee. I am presently taking the arguments used by the Members of this House in the past to take a Bill to committee. It is a similar matter. I am using the precedent involved, Mr. Speaker, to show the desire.

Mr. Speaker: — I do take objection to your quoting verbatim, quoting other Members across the floor when it pertains to a different debate. The principle involved, if you want to state the principle involved that is fine. But not the verbatim report.

Mr. Lane: — I think, Mr. Speaker, on the remarks that I have chosen that only once or twice does it mention the words foreign ownership and I apologize for that. It is stating the principle about taking any particular matter to committee. And his remarks were so good and so relevant and so vital that I think all Members of this House will join with me in asking that they be repeated for the edification of those, as I say, who are wont to forget some of the more grandiloquent speeches that are made in this House.

And again, if I may refer to what the Hon Attorney General said in asking for a matter to go to committee because it was of vital importance.

I assumed that what he said was, in effect, the voice of the Liberal caucus and the Government assumed that, and having assumed that we said, okay, we are going to join you in your request to study this question . . .

That is what the Attorney General said, he is going to join with us to study the request, to study the particular proposal.

Here is a committee that is going to study it as the Minister has said. Let's get to the task and solve the problem for the people of the Province of Saskatchewan.

We urge the Members of the Government opposite. Let's get up to the task and solve the problem for the people of Saskatchewan.

Let's get it to the committee like the Attorney General says. Now he refers again to the speech from the Member for Wilkie:

He gets up and he says today, and again he says he doesn't blame the Minister of Agriculture for introducing the Bill and for saying that it is going to be the subject matter of a review . . . He blames our leader. I can say to him that I don't necessarily blame him for the tenor of his remarks today . . .

This is in spite of the fact that this year he turns around and he is making these points of order every second ten minute period in this House.

. . . because I think the tenor was set by his leader who never was convinced that this matter is a serious matter of political discussion and debate in the Province of Saskatchewan.

I don't think that there is any doubt, Mr. Speaker, that but all Members of this House are convinced, are fully convinced, that this matter is a serious matter for political discussion and debate in the Province of Saskatchewan.

If the Leader of the Opposition (Mr. Steuart) was genuinely concerned about this problem . . .

I am dropping reference to the particular problem with your approval, Mr. Speaker.

. . . concerned about this problem as the Member for Cannington suggests at any rate, I won't even say he indicates it is a problem because maybe he doesn't believe it is a problem, but he clearly left that impression on me and I think on Saskatchewan.

And I think, Mr. Speaker, by the same logic and the same rationality we can turn it around by a refusal of the Government opposite to put this matter into committee is an indication that they do not think it is a problem. And I am sure that no such impression would want to be left upon the people of Saskatchewan.

He goes on at that point, Mr. Speaker, and again I am giving the principle involved, page 2,057:

The purpose of this Bill is to put forward a subject that can be the subject of debate and study . . .

And I think these are vital when we are discussing a question of whether this should go to committee.

. . . and consequent recommendations by a standing committee or a special committee of the House, the basis of which could be possible legislation at the earliest opportunity available by the Government of Saskatchewan. That is, in effect, the purpose.

Now the Speaker has certainly ruled and quite correctly that I can't refer to what the problem was. I think we all knew what the problem was when those words were uttered in this House. And without a doubt they are applicable today and the principle

is applicable today that the purpose should be of this very controversial Bill to be the subject of debate and study and consequent recommendations and the same principle applies.

But the Attorney General gives other reasons for putting this before a special committee. I tell the people of Saskatchewan the purpose is to have it a subject matter of debate. Why, I ask was it proper in that case and not proper in this one when the principle is the same?

The Member for Milestone (Mr. MacDonald) says no and the Leader of the Opposition (Mr. Steuart) says, why. I'll tell you why again. Because you boys don't want to study this matter seriously. I am afraid you want to make it a political issue.

Mr. Michayluk: — Good speech, wasn't it?

Mr. Lane: — That certainly was a good speech. It is an amazing thing how a matter of principle can get so turned around by the Hon. Attorney General. Because again, the same principle applies. Do you now think it is proper for the Opposition to stand up and say, why? I will tell you why again, because you boys don't want to study this matter seriously, you want to make it a political issue.

An Hon. Member: — You're putting your boys to sleep. You'd better wake Dave Boldt up.

Mr. Lane: — Dave Boldt knows more asleep than any other Member on the other side of the House and contributes more to his House asleep than any of the Members opposite do when they are wide awake.

We then accused the Government in that debate of putting the cart before the horse. Now what does the Hon. Attorney General say about putting the cart before the horse and he is certainly one of the farm Members of the Government opposite, an expert about putting the cart before the horse. He repeats the phrase because it was something new to him and he says:

The cart before the horse. Well, I am sorry I can't explain to the Member from Milestone because he is either incapable or unwilling of understanding what the position of the Government is. I say again to the people of this province that the purpose of this Bill is as has been stated by the Minister, the purpose of the Government was to work around this Bill.

That is another reason we now have the Bill before us and I am referring to the Bill. We have got an opportunity to work around this Bill. Make it a subject matter for debate and discussion, not make it a political issue. How? By having this matter referred to a special committee in the Legislature. That is what the Attorney General urged and the principle still applies. But he gives other reasons for referring the matter to a committee.

The purpose of this Bill was to work around this Bill and other issues and other briefs to find the solution

to what we consider to be a problem.

That is the opportunity that a committee will give the Government opposite. To find a solution to what is considered to be, and I think accepted to be, by all Members of the House, a problem.

We assume that it is a problem that all the people of all Saskatchewan agree is a major issue.

And I think that both sides of this House agree that this is a major issue. And I think all the people of Saskatchewan agree it is a major issue. And certainly that is the reason for sending it to a committee.

So the Attorney General then says that this went to committee, the particular problem, because:

The Government didn't campaign on the issue.

Was the next reason.

We did not campaign on . . .

For clarification, it's the foreign ownership issue.

. . . as a matter of legislation. We did not campaign on the foreign issue and if we did the Minister of Agriculture said in second reading it is his intention to hand the matter to a committee.

He was getting fairly desperate at that point with his reasons so we get then, "it is his intention", without a reason at that point. No reason is necessary to send it to a committee. At that point the Minister and the Attorney General gives the classic reason of all time for sending it to a committee and that is,

It is his intention to send it to a committee.

Now you people say it should be referred to a committee and we ask you to join with us in that task to make sure that we have got the best possible legislation that the Province of Saskatchewan can have to meet this very pressing and very important problem.

Now, Mr. Speaker, I urge the Government opposite to join with us, march forward and make sure that we have the best possible legislation for the Province of Saskatchewan to meet this very pressing and very important problem.

I am sure that the members of our side would be prepared to do just that on the question of bargaining.

To quote the Attorney General. And I assure you, Mr. Speaker, and the Members of this House and the public of Saskatchewan that the Members on our side of the House would be prepared to do just that on the question of bargaining.

Now we got into the question then about the particular amendment. The Attorney General, as I say, went through several different motions, gave several different reasons for it. One, that it be a matter for study and discussion and to hear all viewpoints, to hear the different viewpoints, but

above all to come up with the best possible legislation for the people in the Province of Saskatchewan. We can think of no better reasons than those very ones. The reason for sending this Bill to a committee, that this be done in the best interests of the people of Saskatchewan, to give those hog producers a chance to speak who didn't have a chance or who were ignored in the past. Let's give them an opportunity to present their viewpoint and if the hog producers decide that it is in their best interests to have a hog marketing commission, that it is in their best interests to give up all control over the marketing of their produce and the production of their produce. Let them, let them come out and vote for a hog marketing board or a commission. What's wrong with that? Why is that principle being ignored by the Government opposite in this case? All that the Opposition is doing is asking the Government Members opposite to do what they so urged the Opposition to do last year. Restore some credibility to your position and do what you urged the Opposition to do last year and that's go to a committee. Go to a special committee, open up the public debate and the public information and the flow of information back and forth and let the producers who are going to be so vitally affected by your moves decide for themselves, a rational decision with all the information that can be made available to them so that they can say, yes or no, I want or I do not want a hog marketing commission.

We had other committees that came up and the reasons for the committee were given and I am going to now refer to the Hon. Minister of Industry and Commerce (Mr. Thorson). He could very well be a good man and I hope that the Government will accept his reasonings for a committee because I am certainly convinced that if they feel he is a good man they will vote.

If Turtleford's answer to Conrad Hilton would quit shadow boxing with his microphone we could get on with the debate.

The Minister of Industry and Commerce proposed a motion in the session last year that there be a special committee, page 2,259 to 2,260, Votes and Proceedings, 1972. I am not going to read through the full motion.

A special committee to inquire into problems and prospects of business firms in Saskatchewan.

We all know that committee was ignored by the Minister of Finance but that is not relevant to this motion. But the reasons for having a committee are certainly vital and certainly germane to the issue at hand. Now first of all he refers to committees and I think, Mr. Speaker, I realize that this is slightly off the topic, but he refers to the committee sitting during regular sessional periods to deal with all kinds of questions, including the economic questions. More particularly, in the past committees have sat to deal with agricultural problems.

Now in view of the impact of economic forces on our business firms . . .

And I realize this applies to business firms but without a doubt there will be economic forces on our hog producers and our agricultural industries throughout the province and particularly, to paraphrase the words of the Minister of Industry and Commerce, the smaller businesses and small producers that operate

throughout the province. These are his words.

It seems appropriate that the Legislature give increasing attention to the problems of these business firms . . .

I think we can substitute "agriculture producers".

. . . and try to make proper recommendations to the Legislature and to the Government when Government assistance might be provided.

Very admirable words by the Hon. Minister of Industry and Commerce, the reason for a committee. I think that they seem to have forgotten these reasons in the desire of the Members opposite to ignore a committee in this case. In light of the speeches made by the Government publicly about the vital industry of agriculture and the impact of economic forces on our agricultural producers, particularly our smaller ones, it would seem most appropriate that the Legislature give increasing attention to the problems of these producers and try to make proper recommendations to the Legislature and to the Government on government assistance that might be provided.

Now, again, to quote the Minister and why we should be having a committee. He says, I don't want to prejudge the method of co-operation of the committee, and I certainly don't want to prejudge the operation of the committee that would go out to hear the true feelings of the farmers. I agree with the Minister of Industry and Commerce when he says, "I should like to see the committee members decide that for themselves." I don't want to restrict or suggest that there is a restriction on the extent of their inquiry and I agree with the Minister of Industry and Commerce. I don't want to restrict or suggest that there be a restriction on the extent of the inquiry that we are proposing. Quoting from the Minister of Industry and Commerce:

The motion that I have proposed states a general term of reference and in some particular matters.

So, again, we have very strong arguments proposed by the Members opposite and voted upon by the Members opposite as to the need and desirability and the value of a legislative committee. He went so far because he was convinced of the value of these committees, the Minister of Industry and Commerce went so far as he wanted it to inquire into other matters, not just the very narrow field that we are suggesting. The Minister of Industry and Commerce and the Members opposite last year had such faith in the committee system that they wanted broad powers for the committee and a broad frame of reference. It was proved by the Minister of Industry and Commerce when he said:

The committee may want to inquire into other matters or it may have persons make representations on a wider field.

Now he is very convinced of the desirability and he caps it all off by saying:

I think such public discussion of the prospects and problems . . .

In this case business firms and here we can substitute agricultural producers in Saskatchewan.

. . . would be well for them and well for the whole province.

That was the feeling last year of the Treasury Benches and the Government Members opposite.

I think, Mr. Speaker, that because the Members opposite have made quite a campaign of the value of committees and nearly every Member opposite, I think, has spoken on the value of committees that the general principle and the reason for committees is worth repeating because it is a Member of the Treasury Benches that says it.

I think such public discussion . . .

And that is what we are urging with this amendment, that there be public discussion, that there be public discussions on the whole field of marketing boards and the real feelings of the producers and the effect on producers. He says again:

I think such public discussion on the prospects and the problems of business firms in Saskatchewan . . .

And again, these are vital words from the Hon. Member from Turtleford (Mr. Feduniak) who wants to slam the door on the producers and go back to his hotel and sit in his room and hope that the hue and cry doesn't reach him when he says:

It would be well for them and well for the whole province.

Mr. Romanow: — Before you call it 9:30, I wonder if I might make a suggestion as House Leader. We are all very enraptured by the brilliant speech made by the Member from Lumsden. He says it is going to be a lengthy speech and this is a very important matter and I am sure that all the Members on this side would consent to stopping the clock in order to allow the debate on this very topic to continue. We all agree on this side, I am sure. I would be, therefore, prepared to move, unless I hear a dissenting voice from the opposite side.

An Hon. Member: — We didn't get advance notice on that, Mr. Speaker.

Mr. Speaker: — It is now 9:30 and this House will stand adjourned until 2:30 o'clock tomorrow.

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